

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1914.

## ON CERTAIN FRAGMENTS OF PINDAR.

THE Fragments of Pindar have not, so far as I know, been adequately discussed since the great editions of Boeckh and Dissen, and as many of them are extremely important, the following remarks are offered in the hope of turning the attention of scholars in their direction.

*Fr. 172*<sup>1</sup> interests us, first, since it mentions Peleus and not Telamon as the comrade of Heracles in his attack on Troy. But a second and more interesting feature of this Fragment is the fact, which has, I believe, not been noticed by other students, that this is probably from the same poem as *Fr. 227* and seems to follow it directly. Putting the two together, we have one of the longest Fragments of Pindar. The rhythm, it will be noticed, is the same—the dactylo-epitritic. The continuous line of thought thus developed is quite in the manner of Pindar, who often states a general principle and then follows it with a well-known example, which fixes the principle in mind. So *O. 1, 36* sqq., the poet says, 'In truth it is meet for a man to speak (only) what is honourable concerning the gods, for less is the blame. And touching thee, O son of Tantalus, I will speak at variance with earlier bards. How, when thy father had bidden them to that most lawful feast, offering to the gods a banquet in requital of theirs.' *O. 2, 23* sqq., 'When the fate of the gods sends high prosperity to be uppermost again. This saying suits the fair-throned daughters of Cadmus,' etc. So *O. 7, 26* sqq.; *O. 9, 28* sqq.; *P. 3, 54* sqq.; and passim. Our own case is much like these. 'The thoughts of young men, if revolved with toil, find glory. And their deeds, in time, are bathed in light, shining up into the midst of the aether. . . . Did not the youth of god-like Peleus shine, by reason of his countless toils? First with the son of Alcmena, etc.' And the perfect harmony of the rhythm of the two Fragments will be apparent on reading them consecutively. It will be observed that a trochee is lacking at the beginning of *Fr. 227*. I would suggest inserting the word *αἶψα*, which suits admirably both meter and sense. Compare *P. 4, 133, αἶψα δ' ἀπὸ*

<sup>1</sup> The Fragments are cited according to Christ in his large edition.

κλισιῶν ὄρω. It is noticeable that Pindar makes Peleus the companion of Heracles on that famous expedition, as mentioned before, instead of Telamon, as in the more common version of the story. The usual form also is found in Pindar, *N.* 4, 25; *I.* 6, 27; *Fr.* 50, 51, and often in Greek literature. But Peleus is a favourite hero with Pindar, who never tires of singing of the glories of his august marriage with Harmonia, daughter of Ares, when 'The gods did join in the feast, and the happy pair beheld the sons of Kronos as kings on golden thrones, and received their bridal gifts,' *P.* 3, 93 sqq. The compound word ἐπέλαμψεν in *I.* 72, 1, is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Pindar, though the simple word λάμπω occurs no less than five or six times in the poems which are preserved, in accordance with Pindar's predilection for ideas of brilliancy and splendour.

In *Fr.* 177, 4, we notice a metrical peculiarity which calls for some remark. The verse reads αἰνιγμα παρθένου ἐξ ἀγριῶν γνάθων. The diphthong -ου in παρθένου is thus scanned as long, in spite of the initial vowel in the following word. This is exceptional, since it occurs but five times in the whole range of Greek Melic poetry. And four out of these five cases are genitives of the second declension where the termination can easily be emended to -οι', the elided form of the older genitive ending in -οιο. If, therefore, we read here παρθένοι' instead of παρθένου, we secure metrical regularity. The ending -οιο is well attested in *O.* 13, 35 and *P.* 1, 39, these two cases proving that Pindar, unlike Homer, does not hesitate to elide the final vowel of the termination -οιο. The elided -οιο has been restored by conjecture by Ahrens in *N.* 9, 55, and by Mommsen in *I.* 1, 16, and both emendations are generally accepted. The same emendation is easily made in *Fr.* 84 of Simonides, for the same reason as here. Let me make it clear why this emendation seems to be called for. A long vowel at the end of a word before a word beginning with a vowel is *not* usually shortened in cases where elision has already taken place, the sacrifice of a short vowel apparently satisfying the poet's ear. It is worth remarking that if we accept this slight emendation there remains but one abnormal case in Greek Melic poetry, in Pratinas 1, 15, ἦν ἰδοῦ· ἄδε σοι δεξιᾶ, and in this case the sense pause after ἰδοῦ clearly makes the hiatus unobjectionable.

*Fr.* 169 is preserved to us by Plato. In the brilliant speech of Callicles, in the *Gorgias* 484 B, in which that sophist argues that might makes right, he says, 'In my opinion Pindar sustains what I assert, in the poem in which he says, "Law, king of all, both mortal and immortal, makes use of the utmost violence with overweening hand, and calls it just. I infer this from the deeds of Heracles, since he drove off the oxen of Geryon to the Cyclopean porticoes of Eurystheus, without buying them or asking for them."' (It is worthy of note that Plato recurs again to Geryon, in Book VII. of the *Laws*, 795 C, where he couples him with the other monster, Briareus, as illustrating the principle that the warriors in his commonwealth must be able to use both hands alike.) This Geryon, or Geryoneus, is a little known mythological figure. Most of us learned of him first in the well-known passage in the

Agamemnon  
welcomed  
many guests  
and sat

W  
Geryon  
where  
before  
with h  
sit at o  
struggle  
W  
logical  
speaks  
silver s  
of the  
Andalu  
as a S  
Geryon  
'Roare  
Hyper  
depths  
This sh  
glowing  
Geryon  
monste  
ordered  
island  
by Gery  
same g  
bodies  
three a  
were he  
Echidn  
journey  
arriving  
ceived



*Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, where Clytemnestra, in her hypocritical speech of welcome to the returning husband whom she is plotting to kill, refers to the many griefs and anxieties which she has had to endure during his long absence, and says (857-862) in Headlam's version:

'Wounds! if my lord had got as many wounds  
As rumour channeling to us homeward gave him,  
He had been more riddled than a net with holes.  
Or had his deaths but tallied with all tales,  
He might have been a second Geryon,  
Three-bodied, with a triple coverture  
Of earth above to boast him.'

We learn at once from this quotation of the most striking peculiarity of Geryon, viz., that he was triple-bodied. Pindar mentions him again in *I. 1, 13*, where he says of Heracles that 'Even the fierce hounds of Geryon trembled before him.' And in *Fr. 81* we read, 'Thee, O Geryon, I praise in comparison with him. For it is not fitting, when one's possessions are being robbed, to sit at one's hearth and be a coward,' which seems to refer once more to the struggle with Heracles.

We are indebted to Stesichorus for further information about this mythological personage. In the third book of Strabo, 148, 11, we read, 'Stesichorus speaks thus about the herdsman Geryoneus, that he was born beside the silver spring of the river Tartessus, close opposite famous Erytheia, in a vault of the rock.' The Tartessus river is the river Baetis, or Guadalquivir, in Andalusia, so that Geryoneus is thus located in the far west, and Stesichorus, as a Sicilian poet, would be specially familiar with his history. The name, Geryoneus, is evidently derived from γηρύω, so that it would signify the 'Roarer.' Stesichorus, in the poem quoted, goes on to the effect that Helios Hyperion embarked upon his golden cup that he might cross the ocean to the depths of the sacred dark night, and to his wedded wife and his dear children. This shows that the island of Erytheia (reddish) is situated in the far west, glowing in the rays of the setting sun. But the real *locus classicus* for Geryoneus is the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus 2, 5, 10, where the story of the monster is told clearly and intelligibly. As his tenth labour, Heracles was ordered to bring the cattle of Geryoneus from Erytheia. The latter was an island near the ocean, which is now called Gadeira. This island was occupied by Geryoneus, the son of Chrysaor and Callirhoe, daughter of Oceanus (the same genealogy is given by Hesiod, *Theog.* 287 sqq.), and Geryoneus had the bodies of three men, grown together into one at the belly, but divided into three at the flanks and thighs. Geryoneus had a herd of dun cattle, which were herded by Eurytion, and guarded by the two-headed dog Orthros, son of Echidne and Typhon (and therefore brother of the delectable Cerberus). So journeying after the cattle of Geryoneus, and crossing many wild regions and arriving in Erytheia, he camped on Mt. Abas. The dog of Geryoneus perceived him and attacked him. Heracles struck him with his club, and when

the herdsman Eurytion came to support the dog, Heracles slew him. And Geryoneus finding Heracles at the river Anthemus, driving away his cattle, joined battle with him, and was slain by an arrow-shot. And Heracles put the cattle into the cup of Helios and sailed across to Tartessus, after which he gave the cup back to Helios. And so, after many adventures, he brought the cattle safely to Eurystheus.

The character of Geryon seems to have been taken up by the comic poets as typical of the stupid giant who is the predestined victim of the clever giant-killer. His size and limitless voracity must have hugely amused the gallery-gods of the Dionysiac Theatre, as well as the provincial stage.

Athenaeus, in the eighth book of his *Deipnosophists*, 346, cites a fragment of the Geryoneus of the comic poet Ephippus, where the monster is a gigantic king to whom the world is subject. His subjects catch a fish larger than the island of Crete, for which the monarch possesses a kettle of corresponding size, the rim of which is inhabited by Sindians, Lycians, Macedonians, and Paphians, whose duty it is to provide wood, as well as water and salt, for the cooking of their catch. Five boats ply around the edge of the kettle, and exhort the labourers, 'Why don't you kindle the fire? It is cold'; and to the Celts and Macedonians in their turn, 'Stop blowing your bellows, Macedonian. Put out the fire, you Celt, lest you burn the fish.' The awkward figure of the monster no doubt made him a favourite character upon the comic stage.

In the fifth century of our era the Homeric imitator, Quintus Smyrnaeus, does not forget Geryon. In emulation of Homer's description of the shield of Achilles, in *Iliad* 18, Smyrnaeus (6, 196 b) depicts the shield of Eurypylus as ornamented with representations of the labours of Heracles, beginning with his throttling the two serpents sent by Hera to destroy the hero in his infancy, with traces of the scene as described by Pindar in *N. 1*. Then follows the Nemean lion, the Lernean hydra, the Erymanthian boar, the Stymphalian birds, the Augean stables, and the cattle of Geryon, following in general the order of Apollodorus. Quintus, imitating the Homeric style, tells us that thereon (on the shield of Eurypylus) was the form of Geryon, dead among his cattle, his bloody head subdued by the mighty club. In front of Geryon was slain his dog, Orthros, resembling his brother Cerberus, as well as the body of Geryon's herdsman, Eurytion.

I have dwelt a little longer upon the history of Geryon because he is a little-known mythological figure, a representative, apparently, of the rude forces of nature, which it seems to have been the special mission of the hero Heracles to subdue, and thus to tame the earth and render it habitable by man—a mission which is expressed by Pindar, *N. 1*, 62 sqq., where the seer Teiresias prophesies to the hero's father and mother, after their infant son had slain the two serpents, 'how many lawless beasts he should slay on land, and how many in the deep. And many a *man*, too, who walked with crooked insolence, he should give over to hateful death.' The encounter with Geryon is a typical case of this activity of Heracles, behind which the special features

enlarge  
sink in  
Fr  
ἐρεθίζο,  
entirely  
the dol  
the fan  
strictly  
ὑποκρί  
beginn  
ἐρεθίζο,  
χάριν a  
govern  
of the  
we hav  
hymn  
is in ap  
*N. 1*, 4  
somew  
'Thank  
apposit  
can st  
govern  
perhap  
*N. 11*,  
ἐπιεσσ  
will lie  
ἐπιεσσ  
the ma  
widely  
ὑπόκρι  
There  
tives in  
σε βού  
ἐπέχω,  
means  
some p  
sition  
tion in

UNI

enlarged upon by Callicles in the *Gorgias* of the violence done to Geryon sink into the background.

Fr. 235 contains a usage that may be unfamiliar to some. It begins ἐρεθίζομαι ἀλίου δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν followed by a relative, leaving ὑπόκρισιν entirely without an apparent connection. The rest of the Fragment states how the dolphin of the sea is excited by the sound of the flute, in accordance with the familiar conception of the dolphin as a musical animal. ὑπόκρισιν means strictly an answer, as we remember that the actor in tragedy was called ὑποκρίτης, 'the man who answers' the leader of the chorus, and so made the beginning of dialogue. When we endeavour to ascertain the meaning of ἐρεθίζομαι δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν, we are reminded of the familiar construction of χάριν and certain other accusatives in an adverbial or prepositional sense and governing the genitive. This construction probably developed from a free use of the accusative as inner object, in apposition with a clause. Thus, in *I.* 3, 7, we have εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἀποινα χρή μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν. 'We ought to hymn the brave man in recompense for his noble deeds.' Here ἔργων ἀποινα is in apposition with the clause ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν. So with χάριν in *P.* 11, 12; *N.* 1, 4 sqq. In *P.* 3, 95 Διὸς δὲ χάριν, the transition to an adverb in χάριν is somewhat further advanced, and we are inclined to translate with Gildersleeve, 'Thanks to Zeus.' But the nucleus of the clause with which χάριν is in apposition is still an accusative καρδίαν, and therefore the appositional force can still be vaguely felt. Yet χάριν has practically become a preposition governing the genitive, Διὸς δὲ χάριν, 'Thanks be to Zeus.' This usage is perhaps more frequent with χάριν than with any other accusative, but in *N.* 11, 16 we have τελευτάν used in the same way, τελευτάν ἀπάντων γᾶν ἐπιεσσόμενος. 'As the end of all things he will be clothed in earth'—i.e. he will lie in the grave. Here τελευτάν is in apposition with the clause γᾶν ἐπιεσσόμενος, but takes its case from γᾶν. So in *P.* 2, 84, λύκοιο δίκην, 'after the manner of a wolf.' The prepositional force of χάριν and δίκην is found widely in Greek literature, nor is it confined to poetry. But the case of ὑπόκρισιν in the present Fragment is, so far as I know, unparalleled in Greek. There is a like example of this tendency to extend the adverbialization of accusatives in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes, 338, τοῦ δ' ἔφεξιν ὧ μάταιε, ταῦτα δρᾶν σε βούλεται; where Graves says from the scholiast 'with what pretext, from ἐπέχω, "to put forward," as in ἐπισχεσίην in *Od.* 21, 71, where the word means pretext.' This use of an accusative in apposition with the sentence or some part of it in a sense which closely approximates to an adverb or preposition is probably not sufficiently frequent to call for more conspicuous mention in our grammars, but it is at least a noticeable syntactical freedom.

E. B. CLAPP.

## VINDICIAE PLATONICAE I.

As the plan of the Oxford *Bibliotheca* does not allow an editor to justify his treatment of a text in detail, it is inevitable that misunderstandings should arise, and I see that even a competent Platonic scholar like C. Ritter has missed the point more than once in his recent *Bericht* (*Jahresber. für Altertumsw.*, Vol. CLVII., 1912, 1). I make no complaint of that—it was inevitable—but I feel bound to put on record my views on at least the more important problems suggested by the text. First, however, I must say something about the MSS. and the use which I have made of them.

I suppose we have all by this time got over the superstition of 'the best MS.,' which played such havoc with K. F. Hermann's text of Plato by leading him to prefer the most arbitrary conjectures based on the blunders and omissions of B (the Clarke MS.) to perfectly sound readings found in most other MSS. Even Schanz's original text of the first tetralogy is seriously marred by the unique position he at one time assigned to this MS., but it must not be forgotten that he changed his opinion at a later date, and that he has since then re-edited the *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, and *Crito*, on a much sounder basis. Even if there were nothing else, the lacuna at *Theaet.* 208d, 4 Πάνυ μὲν οὖν . . . 209a, 2 λόγον would prove the point. There nineteen lines of printed text are omitted by B, and have to be supplied from other sources, and it is obvious that what has happened here on a large scale may have happened elsewhere on a smaller one. It is now admitted, accordingly, by everyone that the archetype of the second family, the oldest of the Plato MSS. at Venice (T), must be regarded as co-ordinate with B. Following a hint by Jordan (*De cod. plat. auctoritate*, p. 629), M. Henri Alline has recently insisted<sup>1</sup> on the fact that T really represents a form of the text older than B, and I think I can add something to the proofs he has given. No one would ever guess from the printed editions that there are two quite distinct sets of scholia to Plato, but an inspection of the Leyden photographic reproduction of B, and a comparison of its margin with Schanz's collation of the scholia contained in T (*Platocodex*, pp. 6 sqq.) will enable anyone to control my statement that the original scholia of B are quite different from those of T,<sup>2</sup> and a study of their contents

<sup>1</sup> *L'histoire et la critique du texte platonicien* (*Rev. de philologie*, 1910, pp. 251 sqq.). I can recommend this article as the clearest statement of the problem to be found anywhere.

<sup>2</sup> In his edition, K. F. Hermann designates all

the scholia which he found in B as O, to distinguish them from those he found in Ruhnken (R). The fact is, however, that the scholia common to B and other MSS. are regularly added by a later hand.

will sho  
that th  
logical  
mentato  
of Plato  
scholia,  
and inc  
were in  
from th  
the rem  
not so.  
(*Rep.* i.  
μάλα σ  
T is no  
T and  
reasons  
for Pho  
If  
Calligra  
recensio  
writers  
and T  
mistake  
out reg  
for the  
respect  
the ord  
letters.  
self. I  
follows  
διόρθω  
held to  
his ins  
things,  
scholia  
correct  
with th  
MS. as  
an eve

<sup>1</sup> This  
*Introduc*  
duction.  
however  
author o

will show further that they are of quite another character. I have no doubt that they are the work of Arethas, who wished to replace the mainly lexicological scholia of the archetype by biographical notes and extracts from commentators like Proclus and Hermias. Now the chief MS. of the second part of Plato (Par. A.) contains the old scholia and not what I may call Arethas-scholia, from which it follows that TA give us a text quite independent of B, and incidentally that Cobet and his followers, who rejected all MSS. but BA, were in fact basing the text of the first six tetralogies on a different foundation from that of the eighth and ninth. It has been said, and M. Alline repeats the remark (p. 272), that T is a copy of the lost first volume of A, but that is not so. It is true that in the portion of Plato which is common to A and T (*Rep.* i.-iii., 389d) we have a practically identical text, but the long scholium on *μάλα σαρδάνιον* (337a) is much more fully given in T than in A. Accordingly, T is not derived from A, but is co-ordinate with it (though later in date), and T and A together give us a recension which is older than the text of B. For reasons which we shall come to later, they probably represent a *διόρθωσις* made for Photios.

If we confine ourselves to the readings of the first hand, that of John the Calligrapher, I cannot see any ground for holding that B represents a further recension, and here I feel bound to differ from M. Alline and other recent writers. It appears to me that everything can be explained if we regard B and T as two copies of the same text, the writers of which are apt to make mistakes of a different kind. B, as a calligrapher, copies letter by letter without regard to the sense. That accounts for his frequent omissions, and also for the fact that he often writes nonsense. His superior accuracy in certain respects is due to the same cause. T writes more hastily, and he often alters the order of the words because he is thinking of the sense rather than of the letters. We know that, because he often adds the signs of transposition himself. I hold, therefore, that B is not a recensed text except in the sense that it follows the same recension that T does. There is, however, a recension or *διόρθωσις* of the text in the MS. itself by another hand (B<sup>2</sup>), which is generally held to be that of Arethas,<sup>1</sup> and is at any rate that of someone acting under his instructions. Of course, Arethas must have known all about those puzzling things, the *διόρθωσις* of Leon and 'the Patriarch's book,' mentioned in certain scholia to the *Laws*,<sup>2</sup> and he must have had good reasons for taking his corrections from the source he did. Now, as a rule, these corrections agree with the text of W, so that Arethas must have regarded the original of that MS. as in some sense the standard text, and in that case W represents for us an even older tradition than BT. I cannot agree, however, with O. Immisch,

<sup>1</sup> This is doubted by Mr. T. W. Allen in his *Introduction* to the Leyden photographic reproduction. One of his points falls to the ground, however, if we regard Arethas as himself the author of the scholia, which are not derived from

the archetype. In that case, he may well have written them in the margin himself.

<sup>2</sup> The importance of these references has been justly emphasized by O. Immisch, *Philol. Stud.*, I, p. 49 sq.



from whom we have all learnt so much about these matters, in identifying this tradition with some branch of the *memoria non recensita*, and in classing W along with Vind. F, which does represent something of the sort. On the contrary, it seems to me that the original of W deserves the name of a recension far more than that of B and T. It certainly had a far larger number of marginal variants and it had the old scholia. I should not be surprised, indeed, if W should prove to be a direct copy of 'the Patriarch's book,' nor even if that should prove to have come from the Academy. When Justinian closed the school in 529 A.D., it would be natural that some of its MSS. should find their way to the Patriarchate. I shall return to this point later; but I may suggest now that this assumption would at once explain the fact that the recently discovered *Commentary on the Theaetetus* (second century A.D.) has so many points of agreement with W. A full discussion of this question must be postponed, however, till we have dealt with the details which have a bearing upon it. I propose to take the dialogues in order, and to deal chiefly with those passages which have been unnecessarily tampered with by editors.

*Euthyphro.*

2a, 5. ὁ Εὐθύφρων.

It is clear that this form stood in the archetype of BT, though B<sup>2</sup> (Arethas?) has corrected it to ὁ Εὐθύφρων in accordance with grammatical precept, and W fluctuates. Just so, in *Soph. Ant.* 572 the Laurentian MS. has ὁ φίλταθ' Αἴμων, and in *Ai.* 903 ὁ ταλαίφρων γύναι. In such cases, an editor's duty is to reproduce the best tradition, not to follow what may be only an arbitrary canon.

3a, 1. τοὺς τῶν νέων τὰς βλάστας διαφθείροντας.

Schanz follows Gomperz in deleting τῶν νέων, but Adam rightly declines to follow him. I do not think, however, that we should understand the words to mean 'the development or "sprouting" of the young.' The young are the crop, and their βλάσται are the 'sprouts.' The phrase will be seen to be correct if we remember that we could say, e.g., τοὺς τῶν πυρῶν τὰς βλάστας διαφθείροντας.

3e, 2. εἰ δὲ σπουδάσσονται. . . .

The σπουδάσσοντας of B is a characteristic blunder, which B<sup>2</sup> has corrected. Its recurrence in CD only proves the dependence of those MSS. on B. There can be no doubt that TW give the genuine tradition.

4a, 12. οὐ γὰρ οἶμαί γε τοῦ ἐπιτυχόντος [ὀρθῶς] αὐτὸ πράξει.

My deletion of ὀρθῶς (which I assume to have been erroneously repeated from ὅπη ποτὲ ὀρθῶς ἔχει above) occurred a little later to Gomperz (cf. *Hellenika*, vol. i. p. 348), apparently before he had seen my text. I understand the passage to mean 'Good gracious! People must be mostly in the dark as

to what the right thing is. It isn't everyone, I should say, who would do what you speak of (*αὐτό*), but only a man of advanced wisdom like yourself.' Madvig and Schanz assume a lacuna after *ὅπη ποτὲ ὀρθῶς ἔχει*, but this is quite unnecessary. The phrase *ὀρθῶς ἔχει*, 'it is the right thing' is impersonal here, as in *ὀρθῶς ἔχει ἐπεξίεναι* (9a, 7), and it does not necessarily require an infinitive to define its meaning, though it may have one. Of course the phrase can also be used personally as in *ὀρθῶς ἔχειν ταύτην τὴν πράξιν* (9b, 2). Here we can 'understand' *πρᾶξαι*, if we like to put the thing in that way, but we must not say that *πρᾶξαι* is subject to *ἔχει*. Impersonal verbs and phrases have no subject. I think now that I was wrong in omitting *εἶναι* after *ἐπιτυχόντος* with Schanz. It is in W as well as T, and B is prone to sins of omission. The meaning is clearer with *εἶναι*, but not different.

4b, 10. *ἐπεξίεναι* (sc. *δεῖν*) *ἐάνπερ ὁ κτείνας συνέστιός σοι καὶ ὁμοτράπεζος ᾗ*.

Adam gives the right interpretation here. The point is that, if the homicide shares your hearth and your board, he infects you with the *μίασμα*. If you did not come in contact with him in your daily life, it would not matter to you at all. Schanz's *ἐάνπερ χά κτείνας . . .*, 'even if the slayer . . .', therefore destroys the point of the sentence. He himself quotes Antiphon *Tetr.* I. i. 1 which settles the matter, and Adam appositely adds *Laws* ix. 868e *κατελθὼν δὲ ὃ τι τοιοῦτον δράσας τοῖς αὐτοῦ παισὶν ἱερῶν μὴ κοινωνεῖτω μηδὲ ὁμοτράπεζος γιγνέσθω ποτέ*. It may be well to add that Plato only uses *κτείνω* for *ἀποκτείνω* in referring to bloodguiltiness. It is the legal term.

4e, 2. *τὸ θεῖον ὡς ἔχει*.

Schanz suspects these words, and suggests that they come from a marginal note *τὸ ὅσιον ὡς ἔχει*. They will be seen to be correct and even necessary, if we remember that Euthyphron is appealing from human to divine law. See below on 5e, 2.

5b, 4. *διδάσκοντι . . . νουθετοῦντι . . . κολάζοντι*.

This instance shows how old the comparatively few corruptions in Plato's text are; for BTW all have the impossible *διδάσκοντα . . . νουθετοῦντα . . . κολάζοντα*. Schanz quotes Vat. 225 (fifteenth century) for the correct reading. Of course that does not prove it to have an independent tradition. The strange thing is rather that the mistake was not corrected earlier.

5c, 6. *σὲ μὲν οὐδὲ δοκεῖ ὀράν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὕτως ὀξέως [ἀτεχνῶς] καὶ ῥαδίως κατεῖδεν ὥστε ἀσεβείας ἐγράψατο*.

In the first place, *σὲ μὲν οὐδὲ δοκεῖ ὀράν* means 'he pretends not even to see you' (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 119 *μὴ δόκει τούτου κλύειν*). Euthyphron is too formidable a person to attack, as he himself has just said, so Meletos shuts his eyes to his proceedings. It is important to observe that Euthyphron is not, as most editors say, a representative of traditional orthodoxy. He is quite conscious that his views are not those of the Athenian people, and he sym-

pathizes strongly with Sokrates as a fellow-heretic. That is very important historically.

As to *ἀτεχνῶς*, it is hard to believe that it is a mere interpolation in T, and Schanz's view that it is intended to explain the *κατ-* in *κατείδεν* is most improbable. So is the view I once held that it represents *ἀτενῶς* (it was suppressed in the reimpression of my text). The suggestion of Mr. Richards (*Platonica* p. 1) that it should be transposed and that we should read *ἀτεχνῶς* *σὲ μὲν οὐδὲ δοκεῖ ὄραν* (cf. Ar. *Clouds* 425 *οὐδ' ἂν διαλεχθείην ἀτεχνῶς*) is most attractive, though I should prefer *σὲ μὲν ἀτεχνῶς οὐδὲ δοκεῖ ὄραν*. It would mean that *ἀτεχνῶς* was written in the margin of the archetype and that B left it out, while T inserted it in the wrong place. In both cases the procedure would be characteristic. It is odd, however, that we find no trace of *ἀτεχνῶς* in W.

5d, 4. *κατὰ τὴν ἀνοσιότητα.*

I cannot believe that *κατὰ τὴν ὀσιότητα* is right, though it is doubtless an ancient variant. I wish to point out, at any rate, that Adam's argument from the scholium *ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁμοίως, παραπλησίως τῇ ὁμοιότητι* has no weight. It is not an old scholium but an Arethas-scholium, and Arethas is explaining the text before him as well as he can. He could not correct it; for W too has *ὀσιότητα*, and we have seen that his corrections come from the original of W. The correction *ἀνοσιότητα* is apparently by a later hand in that MS. (It is a minor matter, but it is as well to note that there is no lemma *κατὰ τὴν ὀσιότητα* in the scholium, as Adam says there is. The lemmata are due to the editors.)

5e, 2. *θέασαι ὡς μέγα σοι ἐρῶ τεκμήριον τοῦ νόμου ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει.*

Schanz rightly objects to the interpretation of *τοῦ νόμου* as 'public opinion.' Public opinion was against Euthyphron in this matter, as he says himself, and such a use of *νόμος* would be hard to parallel. But there is no necessity for reading *τοῦ νομίμου* with Baumann as he does. The law on which Euthyphron relies is one of the *ἄγραφοι νόμοι*, and therefore he cannot cite any precise text in his justification. He can only appeal to the actions of the gods as a *τεκμήριον* of what the divine law really is. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that the merely human law of Athens would not have allowed Euthyphron to bring his indictment (see Adam's note), and we are probably to imagine him as appealing to a higher law (like Antigone) before an unsympathetic *βασιλεύς*. If that is right, there is no need to suspect the words *ὅτι ταῦτα ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴη οὕτω γινόμενα*, since *ὅτι* depends on *τεκμήριον* represented by the relative. After the parenthesis, the words *μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν κ.τ.λ.* give the purport of the alleged unwritten law and explain *οὕτως ἔχει*.

7e, 2. *ἄλλοι ἄλλα δίκαια ἡγοῦνται κ.τ.λ.*

C. Ritter (p. 5) thinks I should have mentioned that Hirschig and Schanz insert *καὶ ἄδिका* after *δίκαια*. I have, if anything, mentioned such things too

often.  
special  
ἄδिका a  
silence.

9d, 2.

Th  
of ὁ in  
ἐπανορθ  
ἀρ' οὐτ  
thread  
εἰ καλῶ

11b, 7.

Mr  
seems t  
says so  
(Bekker  
howeve  
which v  
synonym  
therefor  
the ordi

11e, 3.

Ob  
therefor  
saw tha

12a, 9.

It i  
and στε  
spite of  
The ῥέξ

No  
words a  
difficult  
ordinate  
verb in  
εἰκειν ο  
νικέειν  
the first

1 Schanz  
γρ. στερῆ

often. Editors insist upon forcing a formal symmetry on Plato which he took special pains to avoid. In the present case some interpolated MSS. have *καὶ ἄδικοι* after *ἡγούνται* or after *λόγον*, but that too is better passed over in silence.

9d, 2. *τοῦτο δὲ νῦν ἐπανορθούμεθα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. . .*

The evidence for *-ούμεθα* is overwhelming (*-ώμεθα* ΞΤ), and the omission of *δ* in T seems to be accidental. Sokrates was about to say *ἄρα τοῦτο δὲ νῦν ἐπανορθούμεθα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ καλῶς λέγεται*; but he interrupts himself at d, 4 *ἂρ' οὕτω κ.τ.λ.* to make sure that Euthyphron accepts the *ἐπανόρθωσις*. The thread of the sentence is picked up at e, 4 *Οὐκοῦν ἐπισκοπῶμεν αὐτὸ τοῦτο . . . εἰ καλῶς λέγεται*.

11b, 7. *ὃ ἂν προθώμεθα.*

Mr. Richards desiderates 'the old *ὑποθώμεθα*,' though he adds that 'it seems to have no MS. authority.' That is not quite the case, though Fischer says so in order to discredit the veracity of Stephanus. It is found in Vat. 225 (Bekker's Δ), for instance, and in the margin of some other MSS. It seems, however, to be nothing more than a correction of the blunder *προθυμώμεθα* which we find in B. The point really is that *προτίθεσθαι* and *ὑποτίθεσθαι* are synonyms. The former is the Attic word, while the latter is the Ionic (and therefore the scientific) term. It is only natural that Euthyphron should use the ordinary word in the first instance.

11e, 3. *αὐτός σοι συμπροθυμήσομαι [δείξαι] ὅπως ἂν με διδάξης.*

Observe that the interpolation *δείξαι* (BT) is absent from W. It appeared, therefore, for the first time in the archetype of BT. K. F. Hermann already saw that it must go, though he knew nothing of W.

12a, 9. *Ζῆνα δὲ τὸν ἔρξαντα καὶ ὃς τάδε πάντ' ἐφύτευσεν  
οὐκ ἐθέλει νεικεῖν· ἵνα γὰρ δέος ἔνθα καὶ αἰδώς.*

It is clear that the archetype had the alternative readings *θ' ἔρξαντα* (BW) and *στέρξαντα* (T and γρ. BW).<sup>1</sup> The reading *θ' ἔρξαντα* is naught; for, in spite of Herodian and others, *ἔρξαντα* can never have had a rough breathing. The *ρέξαντα* of Stobaeus, etc., points plainly to *ἔρξαντα*.

Now *τὸν ἔρξαντα καὶ ὃς . . . ἐφύτευσεν* would be very odd Greek if the words are taken together, though Adam is the only editor who has felt the difficulty (see his note *in loc.*). Placed as it is, *καὶ ὃς* cannot well be co-ordinate with the participle, but must mean 'even he who.' That implies a verb in the third person, and we get *ἐθέλει νεικεῖν* at once from the *ἐθέλειν εἴκειν* of the scholium in Cramer's *Anecdota* and the *νείκεσιν* (i.e., I believe, *νεικέειν*) in the margin of T. In that case, the *ἐθέλειν εἰπεῖν* of W represents the first stage in the corruption. If we remember that *φυτεύειν* is used in

<sup>1</sup> Schanz says '*στέρξαντα* in marg, γρ. b,' but *γρ. στέρξαντα* is certainly in the hand of John the

Calligrapher and not that of Arethas or any later corrector, so 'b' should be B.

Homer of the author of troubles, we shall render 'Even he who was the author of all these things will not revile Zeus.' So much appears to me certain, but I cannot refrain from two rather hazardous speculations.

In the first place, we know from the Venice scholium on *Iliad* A, 5 that, in the *Kypria*, Zeus brought about the Trojan War on the advice of Momos, who may therefore be fitly called the author of all these troubles. It is his special function to find fault with the works of the gods, and later writers tell us that he burst from chagrin because he could find nothing to censure in Aphrodite. Is there a reference here to that or a similar story? Aphrodite, of course, played a great part in the *Kypria*.

In the second place, is it conceivable that Plato read the 'digamma' in his text of Stasinus and reproduced it? We must remember that this letter was quite familiar to educated and travelled men in his day, and it is written once in the papyrus fragment of Alkman. It was also in use as a numeral (=6). If Plato wrote it, that would explain the old reading *στέρξαντα* completely; for the numeral 6 and the ligature of *στ* were quite indistinguishable at a later date.

14c, 3. *νῦν δὲ ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸν ἐρῶντα τῷ ἐρωμένῳ ἀκολουθεῖν.*

So B. Though TW have *ἐρωτῶντα*, T has *ἐρωμένῳ* and W *ἐρομένῳ*. It seems clear, then, that *ἐρῶντα* is the original reading, though Schanz reads *ἐρωτῶντα . . . ἐρωτωμένῳ*. Apart from the MS. evidence, the chief objection to this is that, according to the rules of dialectic, it is the *ἐρωτώμενος* who must *ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ ἐρωτῶντι* and not *vice versa*. This is a case where B displays his characteristic excellence.

16a, 3. [*ὅτι*] *ἄμεινον βιωσοίμην.*

I now regret having followed Schanz in bracketing *ὅτι*. I have often repented of leaving a bracket, very seldom of removing one.

JOHN BURNET.

ST. ANDREWS.

ON T

THE  
in the ye  
discusse  
tradition  
are inde  
1906-190

We  
selves of  
and, if a  
that he  
follows  
tions wh  
Stromate

The  
injury t  
thrown  
in any o  
that we  
which t  
homoeog  
the scrib  
lessness

Me  
should b  
that (as  
with wh

Th  
in the  
I. 67. 2

<sup>1</sup> That  
mony of  
<sup>2</sup> *Encycl*  
*Criticism*,  
16 (1902),  
<sup>3</sup> E.g.



## ON THE TEXT OF THE *STROMATEIS* OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE germ of the following paper is as old as the previous century, when in the year 1898 my attention was accidentally drawn to one of the passages discussed below. But progress was impossible until the facts of the MS. tradition of the *Stromateis*<sup>1</sup> were properly presented—a service for which we are indebted to the excellent edition of Clement by Dr. O. Stählin (Leipzig 1906-1909).

We need do no more than turn the pages of this book to convince ourselves of the large part which omissions have played in deforming the text, and, if a textual critic is to do anything to repair the mischief, it is obvious that he must first inquire into their character. The object then of what follows is not to maintain a thesis but to submit certain facts and considerations which may be of use to systematic students of the traditional text of the *Stromateis* as presented in the above-named edition of Stählin.

The causes of omission in MSS are three. For the first of these—external injury to the exemplar—the copyist is in no way responsible, nor can light be thrown upon such omissions by any study of a scribe's personality as disclosed in any other part of his work. This is not the case with the other two causes that we may distinguish—oversight for which there is excuse and oversight for which there is none. The first includes all the errors covered by the term *homoeographon*.<sup>2</sup> The second those in respect to which there is no evidence that the scribe's eye has been ensnared by similarities of words or letters, and carelessness is therefore alone to blame.

Method in textual criticism requires that the two last kinds of omission should be discriminated, as the effects they produce are often dissimilar, and that (as I have said elsewhere<sup>3</sup>) they should both be established for the text with which we are concerned.

That *homoeographon* has produced omissions of letters, syllables and words in the *Stromateis* the following selection of examples may suffice to show: I. 67. 2 καὶ <ἄλλοι> ἄλλοθι πολλαχού, 79. 3 ὁ Κυμαῖος πρῶτος <τὸν

<sup>1</sup> That is the true and full record of the testimony of L. Laurentianus V. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Ed. 11), 'Textual Criticism,' vol. 26, p. 711, col. 2; *Classical Review*, 16 (1902), p. 309a.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* l.c., p. 713,

col. 1, 'since different kinds of scribes are prone to different kinds of errors we must ever bear in mind the particular failings of the scribes responsible for the transmission of our text as these failings are revealed in the *apparatus criticus*.'

γραμματικοῦ ἀντί> τοῦ κριτικοῦ εἰσηγήσατο τοῦνομα, I 40. I τοὺς <βαρ> βάρους. IV. 125. 3 εὐτυχεῖν <δυστυχεῖν> τε χρέη. V. 92. 6 ψυχὴν ἐνοικοῦσαν <καὶ διοικοῦσαν>, ib. μίαν ἢ πλείους; <πλείους>. VI. 24. I τέλος ἐπιθεῖναι τὸ πρόσφορον <Ἐφορον>, ib. 149. 5 οὐ γὰρ ἵνα δόξωμεν εἶναι <χρηστοὶ εἰς> Χριστὸν πιστεύομεν, ib. 162. 5 εἰ φιλοσοφητέον <φιλοσοφητέον>. VII. 4. 2 ἀποτελέσματα <ἀ, i.e. πρώτον> τὸ γινώσκειν, cf. ib. 76. 5 τὰς ὄψεις αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὰ <ᾠδρα> α χειραγωγῶν, 29. 3 δε<δαι> δαλμένον, ib. 46. 2 τῷ γνωστικῷ <γνωστικῶς> ἕκαστα ἀποδίδεται.

That omission occurred *without* the lure of *homoeographon* may be shown by the following: I. 150. 5 fin. ὅτι μάλιστα <δι' ὀλίγων (or διὰ βραχέων)>. Μωνσῆς. II. 106. I ἐντεῦθεν οἶμαι καὶ <τὸν εὐρόντα> τὰς τελετάς, ib. 115. 2 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως <γίγνεσθαι or εἶναι> τὴν σωτηρίαν. IV. 30. 3 ὡς τὸ πεπυρωμένον καὶ τὸ πεφωτισμένον <τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ φωτός> φῶς οὖν, ib. 92. 4 χαίρων καὶ συγχαίρων <τοὺς δὲ> πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τῷ ἀποστόλῳ. VII. 45. I τὰ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ διειληφώς <δεδιδαγμένους or δεδιδαγμένα> πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας.

The causes which have produced the two kinds of losses that we have been considering are not to have their sphere artificially restricted to letters, syllables or words: they must be allowed to affect larger blocks of writing and to cause the omission of whole lines, single or several. Nor shall we be surprised to find such omissions in the text of the *Stromateis*.

Here, however, it is necessary to discriminate; for the two causes do not produce quite similar effects. The omissions of negligence in such cases are in units, we may say; that is, they are (approximately) losses of whole lines or of multiples of these. But omissions through the straying of the eyes in *homoeographa* from one line to another are not necessarily to the same extent in units. We have always to allow for the possibility of some lateral deflexion. In amount therefore an omission of this kind may from the outset be somewhat more or less than a single line or a multiple of lines. This must be borne in mind when we come to calculations.

In the present connexion Loss cannot be separated from Repetition and Transposition. Meaningless (that is, mechanical) repetition of a unit is obviously correlated to its mechanical omission; and, as I have said elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> transposition of lines and passages is really 'arrested loss.'

There is one element of uncertainty which an inquiry into the constitution of the unit-line, if I may call it so, of the exemplar of the *Stromateis* cannot hope to eliminate, and which therefore it is obliged to neglect. This is the question to what extent abbreviations occurred in that exemplar. That numerals, ordinal as well as cardinal, were denoted frequently, if not invariably, by letters is not only probable in itself, but supported by the

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica* l.c., p. 712, col. 2. The matter is dealt with at length in the *Classical Review*, 16 (1902), p. 308. Transposition of words

also is sometimes due to 'arrested loss.' VI. 65. 6 γεωμετρῇ καὶ γεωργῇ (L, corr. St.) is an interesting case.

indicatio  
πέντε (v  
abbrevia  
ourselve  
as one.

The  
perhaps  
line con

II.  
περιβαλε  
from Ez

I. 1  
κοσιος  
στείας>  
letters, a  
Eusebius

IV.  
δόλια·  
κύριος>  
restored

IV.  
ἀρνούντα  
§ 4. 69

V. 4  
καὶ σωζ  
they are  
caused th

VII.  
φαινομέν  
τῶν πέντ  
inserted  
appear af

VII.  
τὴν ἀκό  
εὐφροσύνη  
one of the  
certain.

indications of our MS. as recorded in Stählin's apparatus; thus  $\bar{\epsilon}$  represents  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$  (vol. i., p. 139. 26) and  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (*ib.* p. 474. 12).<sup>1</sup> But how far other abbreviations were employed we can only conjecture. We must then content ourselves with simply counting the letters, the  $\iota$  adscript of course reckoning as one.

The evidence which I would submit to readers of the *Classical Quarterly* as perhaps adequate to support a definite conclusion, viz., that the average unit-line contained slightly more than 30 letters, consists of the following passages:

#### OMISSIONS DUE TO 'HOMOEOPHONA.'

II. 135. 1 (I. p. 187, St.)  $\tau\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\nu\tau\iota\ \delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ <\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu\ \pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\kappa\omega\iota\ \delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ >$ . Loss of 46 letters, supplied from Ezekiel.

I. 102. 4 (I. p. 66, St.)  $\phi\alpha\eta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ <\tau\omicron\ \omega\iota\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\text{-}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\omega\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{'}\text{Α}\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\rho}\iota\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{Β}\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\gamma\delta\omicron\omicron\nu\ \delta\upsilon\text{να}\text{-}\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ >\ \tau\omicron\omega\iota\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\omega\iota\ \eta\ \text{Μ}\omega\upsilon\acute{\varsigma}\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\tau.\acute{\epsilon}$ . Loss of 80 or 52 letters, according as words or numeral letters were used, supplied from Eusebius.

IV. 33. 1 (I. p. 262, St.)  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta\tau\omega\ <\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\alpha\ \cdot\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\text{ν}\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\ \cdot\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ >\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\ \kappa\tau.\acute{\epsilon}$ . The omitted words, restored from 'Clem. Rom. Syr.,' total 71 letters, 68 if  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  was abbreviated.

#### MECHANICAL REPETITIONS. I. OF BLOCKS OF WORDS.

IV. 72. 4 (I. p. 281, St.)  $\delta\iota\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \delta\upsilon\text{ν}\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \cdot\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\omicron\upsilon\text{ν}\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omega\iota\ ,$  an exact repetition of the last words of § 4. 69 letters.

V. 4. 2 (I. p. 328, St.)  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omega\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma\ ,$  52 letters, a duplication of the same words in § 1, where they are preceded by  $\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\text{ρ}\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma\ .$  The *homoeographon* seems to have caused their repetition in the wrong place.

VI. 35. 4 (I. p. 449, St.)  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\alpha\text{ν}\acute{\omega}\nu\ \phi\alpha\iota\text{ν}\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\tau\omega\nu\ <\tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\text{ν}\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\omega\nu\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\ \pi\lambda\alpha\text{ν}\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu\ >\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\omega\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta\omega\nu\ .$  The omitted words were inserted by Gruppe from 36. 1, where with the exception of  $\tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  they appear after  $\gamma\epsilon\omega\gamma\phi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma\ .$  They contain 63 letters, 59 if  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$  was written  $\bar{\epsilon}$ .

#### II. OF SINGLE WORDS OVER A CONSIDERABLE SPACE.

VII. 13. 1 (II. p. 10, St.)  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\kappa\rho\iota\text{ν}\acute{\eta}\ \tau\eta\text{ν}\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\upsilon\text{ν}\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\acute{\epsilon}\sigma}\tau\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\ ,\ \acute{\acute{\alpha}\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\acute{\alpha}\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \acute{\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon}\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \acute{\acute{\alpha}\kappa}\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\acute{\epsilon}\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\acute{\alpha}\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\acute{\alpha}\iota}\omega\text{ν}\alpha\varsigma\ .$  That one of the  $\acute{\acute{\alpha}\kappa}\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ 's (St. brackets the second) has come from the other seems certain. There are 59 letters between them.

<sup>1</sup> The notes on pp. 446, 447, 449, 489 afford other examples.

Similarly in 15. 1 (II. p. 11, St.) τὸ θεῖον is repeated at a distance of 100 letters from its proper place.

Again in VIII. 14. 3 (II. p. 88, St.) ἀπάντων is repeated 65 letters, or 61 if πρώτη was abbreviated, away from its proper place.

Similarly in V. 94. 4 (I. p. 388, St.) ἐπεῖσοδον has produced εἴσοδον in the following line 26 letters off.

In VIII. 30. 2 (II. p. 99, St.) after αἵτιοι τοῦ the following words, προκόπτειν κατηγορήματος λέγεται δὲ ἀλλήλοις αἷτια ποτὲ μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ὁ ἔμπορος καὶ ὁ κάπηλος ἀλλήλοις εἰσὶν αἵτιοι τοῦ, 102 letters, were repeated by the first hand in L.

#### PASSAGES TRANSPOSED.

An interesting example of *homoeographon* appears in a verse quotation in V. 109. 3 (I. p. 400, St.) :

ἀλλ' εἴ τοι χεῖράς γ' εἶχον βόες ἢ λέοντες  
ὡς γράφαι χεῖρεσσι καὶ ἔργα τελεῖν ἄπερ ἄνδρες  
ἵπποι μὲν θ' ἵπποισι βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοίας  
καὶ κε θεῶν ιδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποιοῦν  
τοιαῦθ' οἷον περ καὶ αὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.

So the passage is given in Stählin. But his order for the last three lines and the ὁμοίας which he takes from the quotation in Theodoret are obviously wrong.

The original form of the verses was

καὶ κε θεῶν ιδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποιοῦν  
τοιαῦθ' οἷον περ καὶ αὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ἕκαστοι  
ἵπποι μὲν θ' ἵπποισι βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοῖα,

with the ἕκαστοι of Hiller and Diels and the transposition of Karsten. The first corruption was the miscopying of ὁμοῖα for ἕκαστοι from the following line. After that, *homoeographon* at the end of the two verses caused the omission of the latter which was subsequently reinserted but copied into a wrong place. Theodoret's ὁμοίας is worthless in itself, but interesting as pointing to ὁμοῖα which in Clement's text, as offered by L, and in Eusebius has been changed to ὁμοῖον. The lines may have been written continuously, and the distance from the beginning of one ὁμοῖα to that of the other would be 35 letters.

I deviate for a moment to consider a textual question arising on the first line of the fragment. Stählin's critical note is as follows :

ἔχον Eus. . . ἀλλ' εἰ χεῖρας ἔχον βόες <ἵπποι τ> ἢ λέοντες . . . ἢ λέοντες] ἢ ἐλέφαντες Theod. MSCV ἢ κέλητες Schultess ἢ κελέοντες Diels Berl. Sitz. B. 1891 S. 578.

The motive underlying these changes is that λέοντες and ἵπποι are 'incompatible' (Diels l.c.). If real 'lions' were meant, this would be true; but these animals are only illustrative. For the writer's purpose 'lions' are as good as 'horses,' and the substitution of the one for the other is merely

legitim  
Persiu  
docum  
artifex  
poetri  
talkin  
This s  
Hor. J  
calce  
both  
diplom  
has sin  
might  
(Crusi

I.  
καλῶν  
αὐτίκα  
ἦν, το  
ἐπιτελ  
αὐτοῦ  
κατά  
καθάρ  
κτίζεσ  
ἐνεργ  
in the  
inevita

In  
ἀπό το  
ἡ ὁρμή  
πρὸς τὰ  
καὶ ἡ ὑ  
παθῶν  
οὐ κρίν  
casual  
αὐτίκα

In  
the Chu  
read οὐ  
λέγοντε  
These v  
ἐξ ὧν ἡ

<sup>1</sup> It is v  
MSS. of  
designed

legitimate poetic variation. One might as reasonably attack the text of Persius *Choliamb.* 8 sqq. 'quis expediuit *psittaco* suum "chaere" | picasque docuit uerba nostra conari? magister artis ingenique largitor | uenter, negatas artifex sequi uoces. | quod si dolosi spes refulserit nummi, | *coruos* poetas et poetridas picas | cantare credas Pegaseium nectar,' where *psittacus* means 'a talking bird such as a parrot,' and *coruus* 'a talking bird such as a raven.'<sup>1</sup> This superficial inconsistency in the details of an illustration occurs elsewhere, Hor. S. II. 1. 52 sqq. '*dente* lupus, *cornu* taurus petit — mirum | ut neque *calce* lupus quemquam neque *dente* petit bos.' The ox, or bull, is formidable both with hoofs and horns: the reader may take his choice. There is no diplomatic reason for doubting our text; ἡ ἐλέφαντες (in itself quite possible) has simply come from a wrong division of words ἡ ἐλέοντες. And that lions might be imagined in the rôle of artists we can see from Babrius *Mythiamb.* 194 (Crusius) εἰ λείοντες ἡιδεῖσαν γλύφειν πολλοὺς ἂν ἄνδρας εἶδες ὑποκάτω λέοντος.

I. 82 (I. p. 53, St.) discusses the question whether non-interference (τὸ μὴ κωλύον) is the same as responsibility (τὸ αἴτιον). §§ 2-5 read as follows αὐτίκα κολάζονται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου οἱ τούτων αἴτιοι· οἱ γὰρ κωλύσαι δύναμις ἦν, τούτῳ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τοῦ συμβαίνοντος προσάπτεται. <διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ἐπιτελεῖται ὅτι τὸ κωλύσαι δυνάμενον οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ οὐδὲ κωλύει> φάμεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸ αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν καὶ δρᾶν νοεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ μὴ κωλύον κατὰ γε τοῦτο ἀνενέργητον εἶναι· ἐτι τὸ μὲν αἴτιον πρὸς τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἐστὶ, καθάπερ ὁ μὲν ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τῷ γίγνεσθαι τὸ σκάφος ὁ δὲ οἰκοδόμος πρὸς τῷ κτίζεσθαι τὴν οἰκίαν· τὸ δὲ μὴ κωλύον κεχώρισται τοῦ γιγνομένου. τί γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ὁ μὴ κωλύων; Prof. J. B. Mayor's transposition of the words which stand in the MS. after γιγνομένου, and break and stultify the argument there, seems inevitable. They contain 64 letters.

In II. 59. 6—60. 1 (I. p. 145, St.) ὁρμή μὲν οὖν φορὰ διανοίας ἐπὶ τι ἢ ἀπὸ του· πάθος δὲ πλεονάζουσα ὁρμή ἢ ὑπερτείνουσα κατὰ τὸν λόγον μέτρα, ἢ ὁρμή ἐκφερομένη καὶ ἀπειθὴς λόγῳ· παρὰ φύσιν οὖν κίνησις ψυχῆς κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἀπειθειαν τὰ πάθη· ἢ δ' ἀπόστασις καὶ ἀπείθεια ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ ὑπακοὴ ἐφ' ἡμῖν· διὸ καὶ τὰ ἐκούσια κρίνεται· αὐτίκα καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον τῶν παθῶν εἴ τις ἐπεξίει, ἀλόγους ὀρέξεις εὔροι ἂν αὐτά. (60) τὸ γοῦν ἀκούσιον οὐ κρίνεται· διττὸν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ μὲν γιγνόμενον μετ' ἀγνοίας τὸ δὲ ἀνάγκῃ even a casual observer may see, what Prof. J. B. Mayor has pointed out, that the words αὐτίκα to αὐτά at the end of 59 are out of place. They include 63 letters.

In III. 52, 53 (I. pp. 220 sq. St.) Clement cites the example of pillars of the Church against the contemporaries whom he is attacking. In 52. 1 we read οἱ δὲ καὶ τούτους (as generally understood, Elijah and Samuel) ὑπερφέρειν λέγοντες πολιτείας καὶ βίωι οὐδε συγκριθῆναι ταῖς ἐκείνων πράξεσι δυνήσονται. These words follow on καὶ Σαμουὴλ δὲ ὁ προφήτης [ἦν] ὃν καταλελοίπει κωλὸν ἐξ ὧν ἦσθι φέρων ἔδωκε τῷ Σαουλ φαγεῖν, and they precede ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων τοῖνυν

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that some of the inferior MSS. of Persius give before or after v. 9 a line designed to get rid of the 'incompatibility,'

'coruos quis olim concauum (or Caesarem) salutare,' which bears a strong family resemblance to Prof. Diels's first correction here



τὸν ἐσθίουτα μὴ ἐξουθενείτω with more on the practice and teaching of Christ and his apostles as regards eating, drinking and marriage; this ends in 54. § 4 ἀλλὰ μὴν ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος κέκραγεν ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις οὐδὲ μὴν ἀποχή οἴνου καὶ κρεῶν 'ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.' Next comes a section relating to οἱ μακάριοι προφῆται: Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, John the Baptist are mentioned. It begins τίς αὐτῶν μηλωτὴν καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην ἔχων περιέρχεται ὡς Ἡλίας; With the present order, there is nothing for this αὐτῶν to refer to, except the New Testament worthies, which is absurd. It must obviously mean the same people as the οἱ in 52. 1. Recognising this, Professor Mayor proposed to move the words to follow *δυνήσονται* above. They contain 251 letters, so that a block of 8 lines would have been displaced ( $8 \times 31 = 248$ ). But there is another alternative. The first passage contains 91 letters, i.e. about 3 lines; and so it might be moved down in front of the second one. This will do away with the break in the exposition of the right doctrine of eating and drinking which is the effect of its present place, while it will also give more pertinence to its expression. For it will now mean 'Our friends who actually claim to be superior to the saints of the New Testament (τούτους) cannot stand a comparison even with those of the Old (ἐκείνων).'

A small and easily cured displacement has occurred at IV. 138. 4 (I. p. 309, St.) οὐ δεῖ δὲ ἀρθέντας μετατεθῆναι ἀλλὰ βαδίζοντας ἀφικέσθαι οἱ δεῖ [τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐλκυσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός] διὰ πάσης τῆς στενῆς διελθόντας ὁδοῦ, τὸ ἄξιον γενέσθαι τὴν δύναμιν, τῆς χάριτος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λαβεῖν<sup>1</sup> ἀκωλύτως ἀναδραμεῖν. The words διὰ—ὁδοῦ, 31 letters in all, were omitted after οἱ δεῖ and reinserted when the words τοῦτο—πατρός had been written, leaving the latter in a place where they furnish neither proper sense nor construction. The correction is due to Potter.

In VI. 80. 1 (I. p. 471, St.) again Professor Mayor has detected a dislocation. The passage should run: κατ' ἐπακολουθήμα τοίνυν καὶ τοῖς εἰς γνῶσιν γυμνάζουσιν αὐτὸν προσανάκειται, παρ' ἐκάστου μαθήματος τὸ πρόσφορον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λαμβάνων, τῆς μὲν οὖν μουσικῆς τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἡρμωσμένοις ἀναλογίαν διώκων <καὶ ἐθιζόμενος συνεχές τι διάστημα νοεῖν> ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀριθμητικῇ τὰς αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις τῶν ἀριθμῶν παρασημειούμενος καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους σχέσεις καὶ ὡς τὰ πλεῖστα ἀναλογίαι τινὲς ἀριθμῶν ὑποπέπτωκεν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γεωμετρικῇ οὐσίαν αὐτὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς θεωρῶν καὶ οὐσίαν ἀμετάβλητον, ἐτέραν τῶνδε τῶν σωμάτων οὐσαν· ἔκ τε αὐτῆς ἀστρονομίας κ.τ.ε., except that the second οὐσίαν appears to be another case of the intrusion of a word from an adjacent line. The words καὶ το νοεῖν (L νοεῖ), which obviously refer to μουσική, follow θεωρῶν in L and contain 34 letters as preserved in that MS. Homoeographon ἡρμωσμένοις, ἐθιζόμενος may have been at work here.

VII. 83. 1 (II. p. 59, St.) appears thus in the tradition (except that L has ἀποκεκαθαρμένους) ἐπ' οὐδενὶ τοίνυν εἰκότως ταρασσεται τῶν συμβαινόντων οὐδὲ ὑποπτεῖ τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι γιγνομένων οὐδὲ αἰσχύ-

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἀκωλύτως Stählin.

νεται  
τοὺς τι  
αὐτῶν  
Wilam  
53 or  
after  
a sense  
gloss  
Our pe  
will he  
after  
μένων,  
οὐδὲ αἰ  
In  
φιλοθε  
χυδαίων  
καθαρώ  
words  
But Lo  
28 letter  
I n  
that of  
In  
τοῦ Πλ  
τέχνας  
καὶ ὄνει  
(p. 137  
ἡ τοῦ  
κυνπτά  
εἶναι τοῦ  
Λόγιος  
maintain  
proposed  
duplicat  
'duplica  
conceive  
μον οὐ  
the text  
similar  
though  
τέχνας  
<sup>1</sup> μὴ οὐκ  
cepted by S  
<sup>2</sup> λέγει S

νεται ἀποθανεῖν, εὐσυνείδητος ὢν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ὀφθῆναι, πάντας ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποκεκαθαρμένους σπίλους, ὃ γε εὖ μάλα ἐπιστάμενος ἄμεινον αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον γενέσθαι (γενήσεσθαι Mayor, Stählin). Professor Wilamowitz has rightly noted that ὃ γε and the words following, totalling 53 or (taking γενήσεσθαι) 55 letters, are out of place; and he would put them after ἀποθανεῖν. But this verb is itself an interloper. αἰσχύνεται ἀποθανεῖν is a senseless phrase; φοβεῖται ἀποθανεῖν would be intelligible. The word is a gloss on ταῖς ἐξουσίαις (i.e. the angelic hierarchy, a well-attested use) ὀφθῆναι. Our perfect Gnostic will not be afraid to die, nor, as he has a good conscience, will he be ashamed to meet the angel hosts. And accordingly, inserting τι after ὑποπτεύει with Heyse or, perhaps better with Mayor, οὐδὲν after γιγνομένων, we may appropriately place the words in question immediately before οὐδὲ αἰσχύνεται.

In VII. 109. 1 (II. pp. 76, 77, St.) ὁπῇ οὖν τινα ὀλίγην ὑποδείξαντες τοῖς φιλοθεάμοσι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας νόμου περί τε Ἰουδαίων τῶν χυδαίων περί τε τῶν αἵρέσεων μυστικῶς διακρινομένων, ὡς ἀκαθάρτων, ἀπὸ τῆς [περὶ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων ζώων] θείας ἐκκλησίας καταπαύσωμεν τὸν λόγον. The words περί—ζώων are senseless where they stand and Stählin brackets them. But Lowth's remedy, to put them after νόμου, is clearly better. They contain 28 letters, and homoeographon περί(τε)—περί will have caused their omission.

I now take a passage where the text of Clement has been used to emend that of an earlier author.

In I. 93. 1 (I. p. 59, St.) the manuscript reads κὰν τῷ Δημοδόκῳ εἰ δὴ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὸ σύγγραμμα 'μὴ δὲ ἡγοῦ<sup>1</sup> τοῦτο φιλοσοφεῖν' λέγειν<sup>2</sup> 'περὶ τὰς τέχνας κυπτάζοντα<sup>3</sup> ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθὸς οὖν τὰ ἀλλὰ ἄλλο τι, ἐπεὶ ἔγωγε ὦμην καὶ ὄνειδος εἶναι.' The quotation is from the *Erastae* attributed to Plato (p. 137 B), where the tradition gives ἀλλὰ μὴ οὐχ οὕτως, ὦ φίλε, ἔχωσι μηδὲ<sup>4</sup> ἢ τοῦτο φιλοσοφεῖν περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἐσπουδακῆναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμονοῦν τὰ κυπτάζοντα ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθὸς οὖν τὰ ἀλλ' ἄλλο τι ἐπεὶ ἐγὼ ὦμην καὶ ὄνειδος εἶναι τοῦτο καὶ βαναύσους καλεῖσθαι τοὺς περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἐσπουδακότας. Cobet, Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς (p. 531) and Professor Jackson subsequently (*J. Phil.* l.c. p. 139) maintained, and this with justice, that the text here was unsatisfactory; and proposed to strike out the words ἐσπουδακῆναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμονοῦντα as 'a duplicate of κυπτάζοντα ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθοῦντα.' But anything less like a 'duplicate' of this than ἐσπουδακῆναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμονοῦντα it is not easy to conceive. And it will be observed that the homoeographon in πολυπραγμονοῦν τὰ—πολυμαθὸς οὖν τὰ was quite capable of causing the omission from the text of Clement of a total of 32 letters. The same cause produced a similar effect in the text of the *Erastae*; but here the words lost were restored, though not to their proper place. The passage then should run περὶ τὰς τέχνας κυπτάζοντα ζῆν, οὐδὲ πολυμαθοῦντα ἐσπουδακῆναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμο-

<sup>1</sup> μὴ οὐκ ἢ τοῦτο Professor H. Jackson, accepted by Stählin.

<sup>2</sup> λέγει Stählin, Professor Jackson, *J. Phil.*

27. 140.

<sup>3</sup> κυπτάζοντα Dindorf.

<sup>4</sup> οὐδ' ἢ Professor Jackson.

νοῦντα ἀλλ' ἄλλο τι κ.τ.ε. There is now nothing faulty in the Greek. *κυντάζειν περί* requires no illustration, and *σπουδάσω* with a participle (*διδάσκων* as here *πολυμαθοῦντα*) is attested in Xen. *Oecon.* 9. 1.<sup>1</sup>

A very natural question now suggests itself. To what extent should acceptable supplements of undeniable gaps in the text of the *Stromateis* be expected to recognise the average unit-line suggested by this inquiry. From the nature of the case the precise form of such supplements can never be free from doubt, and with our present knowledge of the textual conditions of the *Stromateis* a systematic examination of the lacunae might, I fear, be both a lengthy and a sterile undertaking. But I may be permitted to give examples of supplements already proposed which, if the hypothesis we have been considering is correct, will be seen to have unconsciously conformed. I cite then by way of instance the following: I. 17. 4 (I. p. 12. 26, St.) *καθάπερ δ' οἱ γεωργοὶ προαρδεύσαντες τὴν γῆν <εἴθ' οὕτω τὸ σπέρμα καταβάλλουσιν (28 letters, Sylburg)> οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ ποτίμῳ τῶν παρ' Ἑλληνισι λόγων προαρδεύομεν τὸ γεῶδες αὐτῶν, ὡς παραδέξασθαι τὸ καταβαλλόμενον σπέρμα πνευματικὸν καὶ τοῦτο εὐμαρῶς ἐκθρέψαι δύνασθαι.* II. 68. 3 (I. p. 149. 17, St.) *δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως τριῶν ἀποχῆς ἀμαρτίας τρόπων διδάσκειν ὁ νομοθέτης, τῶν μὲν ἐν λόγῳ διὰ τῶν ἰχθύων τῶν ἀναύδων· ἔστι γὰρ τῷ ὄντι οὐ σιγῇ λόγου διαφέρει· ἔστι καὶ σιγῆς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας· τῶν δὲ ἐν ἔργῳ διὰ τῶν ἀρπακτικῶν καὶ σαρκοβόρων ὀρνέων· <τῶν δὲ ἐν διανοίᾳ διὰ τοῦ χοίρου· ὁ γὰρ (31 letters, Stählin, Schwartz)> χοῖρος βορβόρῳ ἥδεται.* V. 59. 1 (I. p. 365. 26, St.) *ναὶ μὴν ἡ Πυθαγόρου συνουσία καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμιλητὰς διττῇ κοινωνίᾳ ἀκουσματικούς τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ τινὰς μαθηματικούς ἐτέρους καλοῦσα, τοὺς γνησίως ἀνθαπτομένους τῆς φιλοσοφίας, <οὐχί<sup>2</sup> πᾶσαν πᾶσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν συνεχώρησεν (35 letters, Mayor)> ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν φάσθαι τὸ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένον εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἡνίσσετο.* IV. 152. 1 (I. p. 315. 25) *καθόλου γὰρ τὸ παθητικὸν <παντοδαπὸν ἐστὶν καὶ δουλούμενον (29 letters, Wilamowitz)> παντὶ γένει ἐπιθυμίας, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀπάθειαν θεούμενος ἄνθρωπος ἀχράντως μοναδικὸς γίνεται.* Lastly in II. 129. 1 (I. p. 183. 1, St.) *πάλιν δ' αὖ Ζήνων μὲν ὁ Στωικὸς τέλος ἡγεῖται τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν Κλεάνθης δὲ τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν . . . ἐν τῷ εὐλογιστεῖν δ' ἐν τῇ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ἐκλογῇ κείσθαι διελάμβανεν.* The supplements of Arnim *Διογένης δὲ ὁ Βαβυλώνιος* τὸ τέλος (29 letters) and of Stählin *Διογένης δὲ τὸ τέλος κείσθαι ἡγείτο* (or ἡγείται, 30 or 31 letters) will both conform, though I should prefer Stählin's, as ὁ Βαβυλώνιος is not a necessary addition in a context where it is clear the Stoic Diogenes is referred to.

A question intimately affecting the text of the *Stromateis* in more than one place is that of Clement's accuracy in quotation. On this Professor Mayor says fairly enough, 'Clement is never very exact in his quotations' (*Cl. Rev.* 8. 237b).

<sup>1</sup> The quotation stops abruptly in Clement, so I note that there are 55 letters from *τοῦτο* to

*ἐσπουδακός.*

<sup>2</sup> Or, better perhaps, *οὐ πᾶσαν* (33 letters).

So at IV. 53. 4 (I. p. 273, St.) where, continuing a quotation of Euripides *Hyphsipyle* (fr. 757 Nauck), he gives according to the MS.

εἶτα ἐπιφέρει·

ταῦτα δεῖ

στέργειν ἅπερ δεῖ κατὰ φύσιν διεκπερᾶν<sup>1</sup>

οὐ δεινὸν οὐδὲν τῶν ἀναγκαίων βροτοῖς,

Clement may have written *στέργειν*, though, that Euripides wrote *τὶ ταῦτα δεῖ* | *στένειν*, the evidence of Plutarch and Stobaeus leaves no doubt.

In I. 67. 4 (I. p. 42, St.) we read *ψυχὰς γὰρ ἀγαθὰς κατὰ Πλάτωνα καταλιπούσας τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον ὑπομῖναι ἐλθεῖν εἰς τόνδε τὸν τάρταρον καὶ σῶμα ἀναλαβούσας τῶν ἐν γειέσει κακῶν ἀπάντων μετασχεῖν ὑπολαμβάνουσι κηδομένας τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους αἱ νόμους τε ἔθεσαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐκήρυξαν 'οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν τῶι τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει οὗτ' ἢλθεν ποτε ἐκ θεῶν οὗτ' ἀφίξεται.'* The reference to Plato appears not to have been identified; but the last words are assumed to be a quotation from *Timaeus*, p. 47 A, B *ἐξ ὧν ἐπορισάμεθα φιλοσοφίας γένος οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν οὗτ' ἢλθεν οὕτε ἤξει ποτέ τῶι θνητῶι γένει δωρηθὲν ἐκ θεῶν*. If so, the quoting is something worse than 'not very exact.' But to me the words *οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν* irresistibly suggest the beginning of an iambic line, and I think that both Plato and Clement may have been quoting inexactly, the former no doubt for reasons of his own; compare his paraphrase of *Il. i. 25-28* at *Rep.* 393 E. Both forms of the quotation fall easily into a couple of trimeters; but all restoration must be tentative. In this spirit I suggest

οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν οὕτε τῶι θνητῶν γένει

ἢλθ' ἐκ θεῶν δωρητὸν οὗθ' ἤξει ποτέ

οὐτ' ἀφίξεται.

Apropos of the *Timaeus* I wonder if a suggestion which I made to the late Mr. Archer-Hind when his edition was preparing and which he accepted has met with any favour. It was that in 76 E the words *δέρμα τρίχας ὄνυχας τε ἐπ' ἄκροις τοῖς κώλοις ἔφυσαν* (with his necessary addition of τ' after *τρίχας*) are an hexameter taken from 'some old physical poet' and accommodated to the prose rhythm.

δέρμα τρίχας τ' ὄνυχας τ' ἐπ' ἄκροις κώλοισιν ἔφυσαν.

The metre and prosody of the verse have nothing alien to Empedocles.

*Strom.* VII. 45. 4 with the following chapter (II. p. 34, 18, St.) is an exalted description of the perfect Gnostic in the genuine Stoic vein. Beginning οὗτος ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικός ὁ πιστὸς ὁ πεπεισμένος ἄριστα διοικεῖσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, in 46. 7 it pursues the theme in the following strain τῶι δὲ ἐνθένδε εἰς γνώσεως ἀκρότητα καὶ τὸ ἐπαναβεβηκὸς ὕψος ἀνδρὸς ἐντελοῦς γεγυμνασμένῳ πρὸ ὁδοῦ τὰ κατὰ χρόνον καὶ τόπον ἅπαντα ἀμεταπτῶτως βιοῦν ἐλομένῳ καὶ ἀσκούντι διὰ τὴν τῆς γνώμης πάντοθεν μονότονον

<sup>1</sup> διεκπερᾶν Stob. Plut., δεῖ δ' ἐκπερᾶν L.



ἑδραιότητα· ὅσοις δὲ βρίθουσά τις ἐτι ὑπολείπεται γωνία κάτω ῥέπουσα, καὶ κατασπᾶται τὸ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἀναγόμενον.

The word in black type has been attacked by scholars who have failed to see its relation to the words which are put in spaced type. Yet no part of the Stoic doctrine should be better known than the comparison of the sage, the perfect man, to the perfect figure, the sphere of the divine and perfect universe and the perfect soul.<sup>1</sup> I subjoin, chiefly from v. Arnim's *Stoicorum Veterum fragmenta*, a selection of passages sufficient to make this clear.

Aëtius Plac. I. 6 ὀρίζονται δὲ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίαν οἱ Στωικοὶ οὕτως . . . ἔσχον δὲ ἔννοιαν τούτου πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν ἐμφαινόμενων προσλαμβάνοντες . . . καλὸς δὲ ὁ κόσμος· δῆλον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ χρώματος καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν κόσμον τῶν ἀστέρων ποικιλίας. σφαιροειδὴς γὰρ ὁ κόσμος ὃ πάντων σχημάτων πρωτεύει· μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσιν ὁμοιοῦται· περιφερὴς δὲ ὧν ἔχει τὰ μέρη περιφερῇ· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸ ἱερώτατον συνέστηκεν ὁ νοῦς, cf. Diog. Laert. VII. 148 οὐσίαν δὲ θεοῦ Ζήνων μὲν φησι τὸν ὅλον κόσμον καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Χρῦσιππος κ.τ.ε. Aët. Plac. II. 2. 1 οἱ μὲν Στωικοὶ σφαιροειδῆ τὸν κόσμον. Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* 8 (in ridicule of the deified Claudius) 'Ἐπικούρειος θεὸς non potest esse: οὐτ' αὐτὸς πρᾶγμα ἔχει οὔτε ἄλλοις παρέχει. Stoicus? quomodo potest rotundus esse ut ait Varro sine capite sine praepotio. est aliquid in illo Stoici dei, iam uideo; nec cor nec caput habet.' Cf. the Herculean fragm. Arnim II. no. 1059 πῶς γὰρ ἰδίαν ἔχει μορφήν τὸ σφαιροειδές.

Schol. in Hom. *Il.* V 65 Χρῦσιππος δὲ [τὰς ψυχὰς] μετὰ τὸν χωρισμὸν τοῦ σώματος σφαιροειδεῖς γενέσθαι δογματίζει. So Lucan 9. 9 'aeternus animam collegit in orbes' (cf. 'orbem' Ov. *Fast.* 6. 271 below). Hieronymus *Ep.* 108. 23 'ossa audis et carnem et pedes et manus et globos mihi Stoicorum atque aëria quaedam deliramenta confingis.' Marcus Aurelius, 12. 3 ἐάν . . . ποιήσης τε σεαυτὸν οἷος ὁ Ἐμπεδόκλειος σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονίῃ περιγηθείῃ γαίῳ. Cf. Id. 8. 41, 11. 12 σφαῖρα ψυχῆς αὐτοειδής, Hor. *S.* II. 7. 56 '(sapiens) in se ipso totus, teres atque rotundus.'

The metaphorical language of Clement will however remain obscure until it is noted that it has a special reference to the central sphere of the universe, to wit the earth, of which, to begin with, we read in Aët. Plac. III. 9. 3 οἱ Στωικοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' αὐτῶν σφαιροειδῆ τὴν γῆν. Next may be cited from Achilles *Isagoge* 4 (II. 555 Arnim) part of the description of the κόσμος as a series of concentric spherical shells τὸν δὲ αἰθέρα καὶ οὐρανὸν (εἴτε ὁ αὐτὸς εἴτε διαφόρος) ἔξωθεν εἶναι σφαιρικὸν σχῆμα ἔχοντα. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν αἶρα εἶναι, καὶ αὐτὸν σφαιρικῶς περικείμενον ἔξωθεν τῇ γῇ· ἐνδοτέρῳ δὲ αὐτοῦ τρίτῃ εἶναι σφαῖραν, τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν γῆν μεταξὺ τοῦ αἰέρος καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν δὲ τῷ μεσαιτάτῳ τὴν γῆν εἶναι, κέντρον τάξιν καὶ μέγεθος

<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of the perfectness of the sphere is of course pre-Stoic. In the *Timaeus* of Plato it appears in more than one application; 33 B (on

the κόσμος) and 73 C sqq. (of the brain and head) are not without their instructiveness for parts of the present inquiry.

ἐπέχουσ  
περιδι  
ἑδραιότη  
ταχόθεν  
πάλιν ὁ  
ἰσορρόπ  
μενον στ  
δέ φατε  
εἶπεν ὁ  
μέσον·  
καὶ συν  
ἀναρριφ  
καταφερ  
apparen  
use of 'u  
of the u  
This is  
which I  
but on v  
fulcimin  
position  
ἐπαναβε  
of light  
premat p  
keeps th  
parts"—  
(angle) s  
down wh  
disclosed  
which is  
bility of  
op. cit. c  
should h  
ὅτι τὰ φ  
τεσθαι δ  
The noti  
M. Aure  
ἐπὶ τῇ

June 22  
U.

<sup>1</sup> Stoic in  
been trace



ἐπέχουσιν ὡς ἐν σφαίραις· καὶ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας τρεῖς σφαίρας ἢ τέσσαρας περιδινεῖσθαι· τὴν δὲ τῆς γῆς μόνην ἐστάναι. This μονότονος ἐδραιότης, 'isolated stability,' is described further on: καὶ τὴν γῆν δέ, πανταχόθεν ὑπὸ τοῦ αἰέρος ὠθουμένην ἰσορρόπως ἐν τῷ μέσῳ εἶναι καὶ ἐστάναι· ἢ πάλιν ὥσπερ εἴ τις λαβὼν σῶμα δῆσειε πανταχόθεν σχοινίοις καὶ δοίῃ τισὶν ἰσορρόπως ἔλκειν ἐπ' ἀκριβείας· συμβήσεται γὰρ πανταχόθεν ἐπίσης περιελκόμενον στῆναι καὶ ἀτρεμῆσαι. Plutarch *de facie in orbe lunae* cap. 6 p. 923 E γῆν δέ φατε ὑμεῖς (Stoici) ἄνευ βάσεως καὶ ῥίξης διαμένειν· πᾶν μὲν οὖν, εἶπεν ὁ Φαρνάκης, τὸν οἰκεῖον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν τόπον ἔχουσιν, ὥσπερ αὐτῇ τὸν μέσον· οὗτος γάρ ἐστι περὶ δὴ ἀντερείδει πάντα τὰ βάρη ῥέποντα, καὶ φέρεται καὶ συννεύει πανταχόθεν· ἢ δὲ ἄνω χώρα πᾶσα, κἂν τι δέξηται γεῶδες ὑπὸ βίας ἀναρριφέν, εὐθὺς ἐκθλίβει δεῦρο μᾶλλον δὲ ἀφίησιν ἢ πέφυκεν οἰκεῖαι ῥοπῇ καταφερόμενον. I have quoted this passage in full because it contains an apparent but very natural and insignificant discordance with Clement in the use of 'up' and 'down.' To a spectator on the surface of the earth the rest of the universe is 'up'; to one at the centre of the same it would be 'down.' This is the point of view in a noteworthy parallel in Ovid, *Fasti* 6. 169 sqq., which I have already discussed and interpreted in this Journal (IV. pp. 196 sqq.) but on which I have now something further to say: 'terra pilae similis, nullo fulcimine nixa, | aere subiecto tam graue pendet onus.' It is thus that the position of the earth presents a parallel to the γνώσεως ἀκρότης and the ἐπαναβεβηκὸς ὕψος of the 'perfect man.' The next pentameter throws a flood of light on Clement's γωνία 'ipsa uolubilitas libratum sustinet orbem | quique premat partes angulus omnis abest,' or, in my translation, 'its very rotundity keeps the globe in equilibrium; it has no corners to depress any one of its parts'—an exact parallel to our author's expression 'All that have any corner (angle) still left to depress them by its downward moment find that dragged down which faith would elevate.' The comparison of the passages has now disclosed that Ovid was drawing from a Stoic source,<sup>1</sup> another indication of which is his identification of *Terra* and *Vesta* and his insistence on the immobility of the earth as the centre of the universe, as we learn from Plutarch *op. cit.* cap. 6, p. 923 A that Cleanthes said Aristarchus of Samos' countrymen should have indicted him for impiety ὡς κινεῖν τὰ τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἐστίαν ὅτι τὰ φαινόμενα σώζειν ἀνὴρ ἐπειράτο, μένειν τὸν οὐρανὸν ὑποτιθέμενος, ἐξελίττεσθαι δὲ κατὰ λοξοῦ κύκλου τὴν γῆν, ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτῆς ἄξονα δινουμένην. The notion of absence of angularity in the perfect man's soul appears also in M. Aurelius II. 12 (I.c) σφαῖρα ψυχῆς αὐτοειδής, ὅταν μήτε ἐπιτείνηται ἐπὶ τι μήτ' ἔσω συντρέχηι.

J. P. POSTGATE.

June 22, 1914.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

<sup>1</sup> Stoic influence, it may be added, has recently been traced in the cosmogony of Ovid *Met.* i. by

Mr. F. E. Robbins, *Classical Philology*, 8. (1913) pp. 401 sqq.

## THE *CODEx BAMBERGENSIS* OF THE FIRST DECADE OF LIVY (I.-VII. 17).

I EXAMINED this MS. at Bamberg in the Christmas vacation of 1912-13 for the purposes of the forthcoming critical edition of Livy by Professor Conway and Professor Walters. In 1856 H. W. Heerwagen described it, and published a collation of the first book.<sup>1</sup> Apart from that it has been until now neglected. Bekker had it sent to him at Leipzig about 1830 for the purposes of his text: on its way back it fell into Kreyssig's hands (see the latter's preface to his edition of Book XXXIII.), but neither of them seems to have made any use of it. It was collated by J. G. Seebode in 1835-8 (as is recorded on the flyleaf); but no results were published. It is, however, curious that Weissenborn in his second edition (1859),<sup>2</sup> though quoting Heerwagen as his sole source of information about the MS., which he calls *B*, cites its readings regularly not only in Book I., but in Book II. also, up to c. 22; after this only four or five scattered readings are cited. The source from which he ascertained these are not known; in any case, they are few and unimportant.<sup>3</sup> Conway and Walters' apparatus will contain the first account of the MS. ever given which approaches completeness. It has now been examined at every point where any of the other MSS. show any variation of the least importance from one another, or where the text has been for any other reason the subject of discussion.

§ 2. The MS. (Conway and Walters' *B*) may be assigned from its writing to the late tenth or early eleventh century. It came, like most other Bamberg MSS., from the Dombibliothek, as the inscription on the flyleaf testifies, *Ad Bibliothecam Reverendissimi Capituli Bambergensis*. Some account of the history of this and the other Bamberg MSS. of Livy will be found in Traube, *Palaeographische Forschungen*, IV. Teil (München, 1904). It used to be assumed that the 'duos libros Titi Liuii,' or, as it originally stood, 'Titi Liuii non minimam partem,' which are mentioned in an eleventh-century catalogue of the books of Otto III., 'quos placentiae inuenit sibi seruatos,'<sup>4</sup> found on the blank page of a medical MS. (L. III. 8 in the Bamberg Library)

<sup>1</sup> *Sollemnia Anniversaria in Gymnasio Regio Baruthino*, Baruthi, 1856.

<sup>2</sup> Preface, pp. lxxvi, xcii.

<sup>3</sup> I have noted the following errors: ii. 5. 1, he cites *B* as reading *ibi*, whereas it omits all from 2. 8 to 5. 3 (v. inf.); ii. 5. 10 he gives *B*'s reading as *uindicias*, where it is really *uindiciae*.

<sup>4</sup> Traube gives further details, partly con-

jectural, of the romantic history of these works, which seem to have been collected by John, Bishop of Placentia (Anti-Pope in 997, and then put to death by Otto); Traube supposes John to have been formerly Otto's tutor. They descend to (St.) Heinrich II., whose name is great in the history of Bamberg: he bequeathed his library to the chapter on his death in 1024.

-13  
sor  
and  
ow  
ses  
er's  
ave  
ded  
hat  
his  
ngs  
his  
he  
nt.<sup>3</sup>  
MS.  
at  
east  
son

its  
her  
eaf  
unt  
in  
to  
Titi  
ury  
s,<sup>4</sup>  
ry)  
rks,  
ohn,  
hen  
n to  
de-  
reat  
his









## THE

were ou  
But Tra  
the sixt  
ments v  
Possibly  
as we  
fragmen

### § 3

5th qua  
I to XI  
the last  
pages a  
at least  
though  
*ab urbe*  
At leas  
any ma  
is that  
III. 25.  
All the  
for inst  
his 'In  
'feliter  
part of  
a hand,  
as 117  
is often  
fol. 60r  
noticed  
in the  
earlier  
interest  
*Minusc*  
only us  
His ha  
often d

### §

appare  
or head  
is vent  
of the  
fewer,  
summa  
in the

were our own *B* and the more famous Bamberg MS. of the fourth decade. But Traube shows (*op. cit.* pp. 11 sqq.) that one of them at any rate would be the sixth-century uncial archetype of the fourth-decade MS., of which fragments were discovered in 1904 at Bamberg by Oberbibliothekar Fischer. Possibly the other may have been the lost archetype of our *B*, from which, as we shall see, the Codex Floriacensis (*F*), which, save the Veronese fragment, is our oldest MS. of the first Decade, was also copied.

§ 3. Our MS. is written in single column, 33 lines to a page (in the 5th quaternion only 31), and contains 112 folios in 14 quaternions, numbered I to XIV—the last three also lettered F, G, H—breaking off at the foot of the last page with the words *trepido agmine inciderunt*, VII. 17. 3. The last pages are very badly worm-eaten, quite as much as the first pages; and it is at least possible that no more of the MS. than we now possess ever existed; though the colophon which stands at the foot of the last page, *Tituli* (sic!) *ab urbe condita*, is no argument for this, being in a later hand than the text. At least three hands were employed upon *B*. I have not, however, noticed any marked difference among the scribes in accuracy. The best and neatest is that which wrote the sixth quaternion, foll. 41-48, containing II. 56. 2 to III. 25. 5. In this part the words are hardly divided from one another at all. All the scribes of *B* seem to have been anxious to save parchment. This one, for instance, finishes Book II. two lines from the foot of the page, but crowds his 'Incipit feliciter' into the end of the line (cutting down 'feliciter' into 'feliter' to make it fit), and begins Book III. on the same page. In the third part of the MS., fol. 49, III. 25. 5 to end, written in another and not so neat a hand, the overcrowding is at times still worse. Some lines contain as many as 117 letters: in this part (not in the others) an extra half or quarter line is often found at the foot of the page, outside the regular alignment. On fol. 60<sup>r</sup>, lines 4, 5, there are ten examples of the open *a* in two lines: I have noticed two other examples on foll. 60<sup>v</sup>, 108, but have not seen it elsewhere in the MS. In *F*, on the other hand (which is, of course, assigned to an earlier date), the open *a* is very frequent. On fol. 62<sup>v</sup>, l. 28, there is an interesting siglum *rX* for *respondit* (IV. 6. 2): Lindsay (*Contractions in Latin Minuscule MSS.*, pp. 3-4, 10) says that in the eleventh century this siglum was only used in legal formulae. Yet another scribe wrote foll. 1-40 to II. 56. 2. His hand is the coarsest; he divides his words more than the others do, and often divides them wrong.

§ 4. A peculiarity of this first part is the existence of marginalia all apparently in the same hand and ink as the text. They are mostly summaries or headings of the ordinary type: nothing in the way of comment or criticism is ventured upon, except 'mira descriptio,' opposite the account of the battle of the Horatii and Curiatii, I. 25 (so again, II. 5-6). They get fewer and fewer, and cease altogether after fol. 26 (II. 15). Among the marginal summaries are other marginalia of a different character—words which occur in the text are written in its margin opposite their place, usually in capitals

and in an abbreviated form; e.g. its first is fol. 11<sup>r</sup>, l. 1, *MERC* referring evidently to *mercato* on the last line of the previous page. Then on the same page we have *LAP* for *lapidibus*, fol. 12<sup>v</sup> *R* for *regum* (?). On fol. 19<sup>v</sup> *INCESSIT*, fol. 22<sup>v</sup> *INCESSUNT* are written in full (in the latter place the word in the text is *incessit* II. 7. 1). And in some cases its words are written in full in minuscule: fol. 17<sup>v</sup> *Inuectus*, 18 *enīueŕ*, 20 *Inopinato*, 22<sup>v</sup> *parma*, 23<sup>v</sup> *conparant* (text *conparandū*). The words (apart from those already mentioned) represented by abbreviations in capitals in the margin are: fol. 13, *augur*: 21, *lapididas*, *abrogaret*, *exactique*: 22, *inuectis*, *deligati*: 26 (the last marginale of any kind), *distineat* (*DISTIN*). On 24<sup>v</sup> *RITAS* (all that can be read) seems to refer to *caritate*. — Urlichs (*Eos*, I. 1, pp. 84 sqq.), who noticed these marks, suggests that they refer to words which stood at the top of a page or column of *B*'s archetype. But the intervals at which they occur are so completely irregular that this does not seem likely: and on fol. 21<sup>r</sup> there are three within thirteen lines. On the other hand, they are not all rare words of the kind that we might expect to have been specially noted for a glossary. They might, however, be simply lemmata for a commentary. A note like that in *P* (v. inf.), fol. 7<sup>r</sup>, *FASTI ET NEF. D*, opposite *nefastos dies fastosque* (N.B. neglect of order and case) strongly favours this view.

§ 5. Turning over the leaves of the tenth-century Paris MS. (*P*, Bibl. Nat. 5725 Lat.) on a recent visit to that city, I discovered that the marginalia of *B* seem to correspond, as far as they go, exactly with those of *P*. (*F*, on the other hand, though *B*'s own twin, seems to have no correspondence with it in this respect: it has few marginalia of any kind.) The marginalia of *P* may be divided into three classes: (1) Corrections of the text by *P*<sup>2</sup> or later correctors. Of course *B* has nothing corresponding to this. (2) Marginal summaries, almost always in the same hand and ink as the text, though one or two have been added by later hands. Wherever I have notes of the marginal summaries of *B*, I find the same to exist in *P*. Photographs of three pages of *B*, foll. 6<sup>v</sup>, 7<sup>r</sup>, and 21<sup>r</sup>, corresponding to within a few lines with the folia similarly numbered in *P*, show how close the correspondence is. The *Unde Interregnum* of *P*, fol. 6<sup>v</sup> (top), does not show in *B* (though it might conceivably be at the bottom of the previous page); otherwise, except for trifling errors such as *B*'s *Laus mammae* (sic) for the *Laus numae* of *P*, the headings or summaries are identical. It seems fair therefore to presume that no heading occurs in *B* which is not also to be found in *P*. Such summaries in *P* are very infrequent (though they do occur here or there) in Book II. after the point at which those of *B* cease; and seem hardly to be found in later books, except in Book IV., where, for some reason, they are regular. (3) Repetitions in the margin of words in the text, usually, though not always, abbreviated and in capitals, answering to those noted above in *B*. Every note of this kind which occurs in *B* (except the *R* of fol. 12<sup>v</sup>, which is in any case a doubtful example) is to be found in the corresponding place in *P*. But in *P* there are a great many more of them; not only are there many

addition  
to be fo  
frequen  
is that  
nearly a  
character  
and their  
where s  
observes  
with the  
*F* was c

§ 6.  
text. I  
obvious  
*F*, was  
wofully  
of *F*. 7  
*Lucretia*  
VII. 12  
close re  
Conway  
the reac  
*reipublic*  
confirm

§ 7  
which in  
to *B* is  
*B* conta  
dominis  
§ 8  
the orig  
or less  
stitute  
in I. 19  
time th  
overlook  
MSS., I  
an eras  
the num  
*insensus*

<sup>1</sup> They  
6. 4. 61.  
18. 3. 18.  
35. 7. 40.

additional examples within that part of the first two books in which they are to be found in *B*; but they are continued, though perhaps with diminishing frequency, throughout the whole MS. What is especially interesting, perhaps, is that these notes, as distinct from the ordinary marginal summaries, are nearly all in an ink perceptibly paler than that of the text. This is the characteristic mark of the corrector of *P* called *P*<sup>2</sup> by Conway and Walters: and their Notes show that wherever *P* differs from *FB* the corrections of *P*<sup>2</sup>, where such exist, tend to bring it into line with them. Professor Walters observes that the discovery about the marginalia would seem to fit very well with the view that the corrector *P*<sup>2</sup> had before him the archetype from which *F* was copied, and from which, later, *B* was drawn.

§ 6. Our MS. represents the 'northern tradition' of the Nicomachean text. Its similarity to the Parisinus (*P*), the chief northern MS., was at once obvious to Heerwagen. In his time the other Paris MS. of the first decade, *F*, was unexplored. *F* has the distinction of seniority, but its value has been woefully lessened by its correctors. Now *B* has been found to be the twin of *F*. That it is not a copy of *F* is certain, since in III. 44. 1 (*urbe nefas . . . Lucretiae*), in III. 64. 3 (*Quid . . . adorti essent*), in V. 31. 4 (*in fuga*), in VII. 12. 8 (*res*), words and phrases omitted in *F* are found in *B*. But their close relationship will be evident on the most cursory inspection of Professor Conway's critical apparatus. To take one instance out of hundreds: II. 47. 12, the reading of all other MSS. is *salubri reip. parte*: but Gruter's conjecture, *reipublicae arte*, made before either *F* or *B* had been heard of, has now been confirmed by *reiparte* having been found in both.

§ 7. *B* has in common with *F* the large lacuna in Book IV. 21. 6—50. 4, which in *F* occurs between two pages, in *B* in the middle of a line. Peculiar to *B* is a lacuna in Book II. 2. 8, *eadem multis*—5. 3, *eis hominum*. Like *F*, *B* contains only one Nicomachean subscription, the 'Victorianus emendabam dominis symmachis' at the end of the first book.

§ 8. In the part of the text contained in *B* there are 49 places in which the original reading of *F* is unknown,<sup>1</sup> and at least 123 in which it is more or less hypothetical. The great value of *B* is that it enables us to reconstitute in these places the text of the common archetype of *BF*. E.g., in I. 19. 6 Professor Conway has been enabled by *B* to restore for the first time the true reading, *desuntque sex dies* (written in *B* *des qui dies*). This was overlooked by Heerwagen. *F*'s corrector, like the scribes of all other extant MSS., has not understood what he took for the relative, and so in *F* there is an erasure of two letters before *dies*. In no other MS. is there any trace of the numeral at all. A few other instances are: III. 28. 9 (*is ignominiam infensus addidit*) *infensus HRn?* *Dald: insensus ML: incensus PUPBOD*<sup>4</sup>—in *F*

<sup>1</sup> They are: I. 5. 6, 18. 9, 19. 6, 23. 9, II. 6. 2, 6. 4, 61. 3, III. 11. 11, 12. 4 (*bis*), 14. 6, 16. 4, 18. 3, 18. 11, 28. 9, 29. 5, 34. 8, 35. 2 (*bis*), 35. 5, 35. 7, 40. 12, 48. 1, 49. 3, 51. 8, 52. 2, IV. 2. 7, 3. 12, 6. 3, 7. 1, 7. 7, 13. 2, 15. 7, 19. 2, 58. 13, 59. 6, 61. 4, V. 3. 4, 4. 8, 6. 7, 36. 9, 40. 4, 44. 1, 53. 2, VI. 1. 3, 13. 7, 18. 1, 42. 2, 42. 14.



the word has been entirely lost in the erasure. III. 40. 12, *decemuirum* (gen. pl.) *ipse* scil. *unus* (cf. IX. 34. 1; XXVII. 8. 4) *MPBRnDL*: *decemuir ipse UpOHRn<sup>2</sup>D<sup>x</sup>*—in *F* the noun is completely erased. V. 44. 1, *eguit* (rightly) is given by Upsaliensis: *ego id P<sup>2</sup>B*: *egit MF<sup>3</sup>OHDLA*—in *F* all but the letters *eg* . . has perished in the erasure and correction made by *F<sup>3</sup>*.

§ 9. Of the 122 places where the corrector has only partially succeeded in obliterating what stood in *F* and where the symbol *F?* is used in Conway and Walters' critical notes, *B* confirms the reading suggested for *F* in 86 cases and differs from it in 36.<sup>1</sup> I have myself examined *F* at some of the most important of these points, specially for the purpose of comparison with *B*. E.g., II. 34. 12, *Haud tam facile dictu est* is the reading of *UpRn*. Apart from *F*, all other MSS. and *B* have *dictum est*, which is kept by Alschevski. In *F* the state of the parchment-surface makes it just possible (though very doubtful) that a contraction-stroke may have originally stood above the *u* and been erased. This hypothesis is favoured by the report of *B*. In IV. 2. 3, *maximum Romae praemium seditionum esse; ideo < eas > singulis uniuersisque semper honori fuisse*, *MPUpBOHDLA*<sup>1</sup> have *id et singulis*. *Ideo* was the conjecture of Weissenborn, *eas* is the insertion of Conway and Walters.<sup>2</sup> In *F*, the three letters which follow *id*- are joined together in such a way as to make it doubtful whether they really are *et s*, and it is suggested that *F* has *ideo*. The centre letter of the three, however, seems too triangular to be an *o*, and *B*'s reading is an additional argument for Weissenborn's originality. In § 11 (according to Conway and Walters' arrangement; otherwise § 4) of the same chapter *quem ad modum plebs gloriari posset*, it is thought that *F* may possibly have had *gloriaretur*, as in the *gloriari possent* of *F<sup>3</sup>* the last word and the latter part of the first are written somewhat closely over an erasure. But *B* agrees with *F<sup>3</sup>*, *gloriari possent*. V. 27. 11, *Fides Romana, iustitia imperatoris . . . celebrantur* is the reading of *MPF<sup>x</sup>UpOEHDLA*, and, almost certainly, of *F* himself, although it has been overwritten in blacker ink by *F<sup>x</sup>*: *B* here exhibits (with *Ver.*) a genuine difference, *celebratur*. V. 47. 2, *saxo in adscensum aequo* is the emendation of Heraeus. In *F* the *-u* of *ascensu* has been overwritten by its corrector, and there seems to be an erasure after (not above) it, but perhaps hardly large enough to have held a normal-sized *m*. *B*, with *MPH<sup>2</sup>*, has *ascensu*.

§ 10. Turning to those passages in which there is no doubt of *F*'s reading, we find the comparison between *F* and *B* no longer so favourable to the latter: *B* is clearly a less accurate copy of the archetype, and acquires merit beyond its twin solely through having escaped correction. Of 290 places in which *FB* differ (of course the number of cases in which they agree is enormously larger) there are only 85 in which the difference is in *B*'s favour.

<sup>1</sup> I. 11. 8, 17. 2, 28. 4, 56. 1, 56. 11, II. 10. 5, 18. 3, 18. 11, 24. 5, 27. 2, 34. 12, 39. 3, 52. 5, III. 9. 1, 11. 12, 12. 4, 12. 5, 19. 1, 45. 2, 56. 9, IV. 2. 3, 2. 11 (*bis*), 2. 13, 3. 10, 7. 9-10, 12. 8,

13. 13, 19. 2, 58. 6, V. 18. 1, 27. 11, 47. 2, 47. 7, 47. 9, VI. 2. 10.

<sup>2</sup> See their article, *C. Q.* v. (1911), p. 5.

Apart from  
may qu  
other M  
perdita  
blunder  
III. 19.  
B with  
'correct  
forte, F  
O, B, a  
administ  
§ 11  
amend t  
non PU  
. . . di  
different  
§ 11  
biblioth  
Bamber  
and afte  
make th  
Conway  
former,  
manusc



Apart from the places mentioned above, in which *B* supplies lacunae in *F*, we may quote as instances: II. 26. 1, *B* with *MP* in urbem (*nuntiatum est*), *F* and other MSS. in urbe. III. 19. 4 (the tribunes conducted themselves), *ut in perdita domo*. *B* alone with *Ver.* and *D*<sup>3</sup> has *domo*, all other MSS. the blunder *modo* (*perdita* being taken to agree with *lingua*, the word following). III. 19. 12, *Nescio quo fato magis bellantes quam pacati propitios habemus deos*. *B* with *Ver.* *P*<sup>2</sup> *UpO* has *fato*, *F* and all other MSS. *facto* (which *F*<sup>3</sup> has 'corrected' to *pacto*). VI. 9. 10, *porta . . . quae una forte non obsidebatur*, *B* has *forte*, *F* *fronte*. In II. 56. 2, *permissurum HRnDL administraturum P<sup>2</sup>F ? O*, *B*, along with *Vorm.MPU<sup>2</sup>*, has preserved both readings side by side, *administraturum permissurum*.

§ 11. There is seldom evidence of any conscious attempt on *B*'s part to amend the archetype, though we may quote: II. 7. 10, *adeone] adeon F.*; *adeo non PU<sup>2</sup>B*; III. 67. 11, *submouit] subuit F*; *subcubuit B*; VI. 14. 13, *differenti . . . dicenti F<sup>1</sup>al* (*differenti . . . dicendi F ?*); *differendi . . . dicendi B<sup>1</sup>*, *differenti . . . dicendi B*. [*F*<sup>1</sup>=the first hand in *F* correcting himself.]

§ 12. I have to express my heartiest thanks to Dr. Fischer, Kgl. Oberbibliothekar, and Drs. Plöbst and Müller, Kustodes of the Royal Library at Bamberg, for their kindness and help, both when I was working in the library and afterwards in ascertaining for me some further readings of *B* required to make the account complete. I need hardly say how grateful I am to Professor Conway and Professor Walters for their help at every point, especially to the former, to whom I owe the opportunity of making acquaintance with the manuscript.

A. H. KYD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

#### IN MEMORIAM.

The writer of this paper, Alastair Hope Kyd, Assistant Lecturer in the University of Manchester, and formerly scholar of Wadham College, Oxford, was engaged in making a few final additions to it, when he was seized by an illness which ended fatally only five days later (April 26, 1914). This has been his only complete contribution to scholarship, and he was able to send it to the Editors in its present form; but the duty of seeing it through the press has fallen to me. At one point (p. 250, line 12 from foot) I sought to supplement Mr. Kyd's notes by direct information from Bamberg, but by the lamentable outbreak of war in Europe we are now cut off from the kind help of Herr Fischer.

Even the readers of this paper, to whom Mr. Kyd was a stranger, will realise how bright a promise has been cut short. His colleagues at Manchester and his many friends mourn the loss of a frank, unselfish, and singularly lovable comrade.

R. S. C.

# NOTES ON OVID'S *IBIS*, *EX PONTO LIBRI*, AND *HALIEVTICA*.

## IBIS 131-132

quam dolor hic umquam spatio euanescere possit,  
leniat aut odium tempus et hora meum.

Here 'spatio' means 'lapse of time': it is illustrated by *A. A. II. 113*

forma bonum fragile est, quantumque accedit ad annos,  
fit minor et spatio carpitur ipsa suo.

As regards the whole couplet, besides at this place, it is found also after line 40 in all the MSS. except the Galeanus Vaticanus and Phillipps MS. There, though it fits in with the context, it is not required: here (after 130) it is indispensable. It should therefore be omitted from the text after line 40, where its presence is due to that species of interpolation which consisted in the insertion of other portions of a writer's work kindred in meaning, on which see Mr. Hall's *Companion to Classical Texts*, p. 198.

## IBIS 137-140

tecum bella geram : nec mors mihi finiet iras,  
saeua sed in Manis Manibus arma dabit.  
tum quoque, cum fuero uacuas dilapsus in auras,  
exanguis mores oderit umbra tuos.

These two couplets are closely connected in sense, and should not be separated from one another by such transposition as Mr. Housman has introduced into the text in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. In the first couplet Ovid says that death will not end his wrath, but will furnish his spirit with merciless arms against the spirit of his enemy. This idea is repeated in the next couplet with redundancy characteristic of Ovid. Heinsius' emendation 'dabit' is preferable to 'dabo,' the reading of the MSS., because Death is the subject and efficient factor in the sentence. 'Dabo' originated through assimilation to the termination of 'fuero' in the next line, and possibly of 'ero' in line 144. This class of error is treated by Mr. Hall, *loc. cit.*, p. 174. The forms of this verb are often confused in MSS. Thus at *ex P. I. 2. 90*

meque minus, uitam cui dabat ipse, capi,

'dabat,' restored by conjecture by Merkel, is right because it accounts for the reading of the three best MSS., 'dabit,' for which the rest have 'dedit.'

## NOTES

IBIS

Here  
adventur  
Ehwald  
das folge  
seine *avθ*  
who was  
the mean  
meek' (π

I pr  
*inmitis* t  
*Διὸς τυρ*  
*μέμφιν* o  
Zeus wa  
brutish  
ready to  
error is c  
of 'parun

the 'in'  
good ins

Here, fo  
interpret  
found in  
preserve  
antithesi  
'densus

For  
parum p  
XIII. 73

IBIS

Thi  
and hin  
Minns,

IBIS 289-90

utque parum mitis, sed non inpune, Prometheus  
aeris uolucres sanguine fixus alas.

Here 'parum mitis' has caused trouble. Ellis translates, 'whose ill-adventured philanthropy': but this meaning cannot be extracted from 'parum.' Ehwald (*Jahresbericht* XXXI. 190) says: 'ich glaube das *parum mitis* ist wie das folgende *sed non inpune* zeigt, auf die Schuld des Pr., zu beziehen und auf seine *αἰθαδία*': that is to say, it refers to the defiant character of Prometheus, who was not sufficiently disposed to yield to Zeus. This seems to me to force the meaning of *mitis*, which means 'gentle' (εὔνους) rather than 'yielding, meek' (τάπεινος).

I propose to read 'parum inmitis.' Prometheus was not, like Zeus, *inmitis* to mankind, but was considerate (Aesch. *P. V.* 10, ὡς ἂν διδαχθῇ τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα | στέργειν, φιλανθρώπου δὲ παύεσθαι τρόπον. 445 λέξω δὲ, μέμψιν οὕτιν' ἀνθρώποις ἔχων, | ἀλλ' ὧν δέδωκ' εὐνοίαν ἐξηγούμενος); whereas Zeus was an insolent monarch, cruel towards mankind. 'Miserable and brutish as their state was, he would take no heed of them; but was even ready to sweep away their whole race' (Prickard, Aesch. *P. V.* p. vi). The error is due to haplography: the 'in' of 'inmitis' disappeared beside the 'um' of 'parum,' as in Iuu. XI. 106

ac nudam effigiem in clipeo uenientis et hasta

the 'in' (inserted by Valesius) disappeared beside the 'm' of 'effigiem.' A good instance from Ovid is quoted by Mr. Hall, *l.c.*, p. 190, *ex P. I.* 4. 35

nos fragili ligno uastum sulcauimus aequor:  
quae tulit Aesoniden, densa carina fuit.

Here, for 'densa' the Hamburgensis, our best MS., has 'sa,' which was misinterpreted as a contraction, and gave rise to the pointless reading 'sacra' found in many MSS., and interpolated from I. 3. 76. It is clear that 'densa,' preserved by the excerpta Scaligeri, is the right word, for it supplies the antithesis required to 'fragili.' 'Densa carina,' a 'solid ship,' is like Lucan's 'densus murus' (*Phars.* III. 491) and like Homer's πυκινὸς δόμος.

For 'parum' cp. 521, 'parum stabili carmine'; *ex P. II.* 10. 15, 'Naso parum prudens'; III. 2. 80, 'parum fausta puppe'; for 'inmitis' cp. *Met.* XIII. 739, 'genus haud inmite uirorum.'

IBIS 307-308

aut pia te caeso dicatur adultera, sicut  
qua cecidit Leucon uindice dicta pia est.

This Leucon appears to have been a son of Paerisades, king of Bosphorus, and himself to have been king of Bosphorus in the third century B.C. See Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (1913), p. 581.

## IBIS 413-416

qualis Achaemenidae, Siculo desertus in Aetna  
Troica cum uidit uela uenire, fuit,  
qualis erat nec non fortuna binominis Iri,  
quique tenent pontem, † que tibi † maior erit.

So the last pentameter stands in the MSS., except that for 'que' the Galeanus has 'qui,' the Bodleian Can. Lat. 20 'qua'; the last MS. also has the extraordinary reading 'maphor' for 'maior.'

Most editors mark the line as corrupt, and no satisfactory solution has been proposed. I believe that 'maior' is an interpolation which arose from line 412

euenient aut his non leuiora malis.

The error is due to what Havet calls the suggestion of the context (*Manuel de Critique Verbal*, ch. XXV). It was felt that, as there, so in this line, a comparative was wanted. But what is wanted is the correlative to balance 'qualis.' I read

quique tenent pontem, uae tibi talis erit.

The construction is: 'qualis fortuna Achaemenidae fuit, et qualis erat fortuna Iri qualisque est eorum fortuna qui tenent pontem [beggars], talis uae! tibi fortuna erit.' For the omission of the antecedent 'eorum' before 'qui' cp. 295

nec tibi fida magis misceri pocula possint  
quam (ei) qui cornigero de Ioue natus erat.

259

nec plus aspicias quam (is) quem sua filia rexit.

Iuu. I. 161

accusator erit (ei) qui uerbum dixerit 'hic est.'

For the use of 'uae' absolute, cp. 203

tot tibi uae misero uenient talesque ruinae.

Am. III. 6. 101

huic ego uae demens narrabam fluminum amores.

## IBIS 445-446

et quae Pitthides fecit fraterque Medusae  
eueniant capiti uota sinistra tuo.

So I think the couplet should be read. 'Pitthides' is the conjecture of Salvagnius for 'Penthides' and other corruptions in the MSS. 'Fraterque Medusae' is the reading of the Galeanus, Phillippis and Paris MSS., and is preferable to the obscure 'de fratre Medusae' of the rest, accepted by Ellis. I may note in passing that this is one of the passages in which Ellis deserted the reading of the Galeanus in spite of the importance which he assigned to it. In the readings 137, 'tecum bella geram,' and 468, 'Dexionesque,' its excellence is undoubted.

Pitthides is Theseus, the grandson of Pittheus, the father of his mother

Aethra.  
δὲ καὶ Ν  
ἐγένετο,  
cated by  
and the  
dispatch

For the

II. 5. 6,

IBIS

Her  
and othe  
is Simon  
that I an  
'Sa  
in Thess  
vention  
in the r  
Crannon  
nobilem  
ornandi  
illum sor  
carmine  
Phaedrus  
Simonidi  
opere eu  
spatio co  
cognatis  
'Ste

So Micy  
p. 287.  
tion wou  
II. 629,  
habent f  
distress  
eripiunt  
persons f  
other au  
Quintilia

Aethra. The 'frater Medusae' is Eurystheus: Apollodorus II. 4. 5, *Σθενέλου δὲ καὶ Νικίππης τῆς Πέλοπος Ἀλκινόη καὶ Μέδουσα, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ Εὐρυσθεὺς ἐγένετο, ὃς καὶ Μυκηνῶν ἐβασίλευσεν*. The reference is to the curses imprecated by Theseus against Hippolytus (Eur. *Hipp.* 887, foll. Cic. *Off.* III. 25, 94), and the evil wishes expressed against Hercules by Eurystheus when he dispatched him to perform his labours. Cf. *Heroid.* IX. 7

hoc uelit Eurystheus, uelit hoc germana Tonantis.

For the expression 'uota facere' cp. *ex P.* I. 6. 38,

atque aliquis pendens in cruce uota facit.

II. 5. 6, 'ut faciam talia uota.'

#### IBIS 509-510

lapsuramque domum subeas, ut sanguis Aleuae,  
stella Leoprepidae cum fuit aequa uiro.

Here 'Leoprepidae' is the certain emendation of Scaliger for 'leotepide' and other corruptions in the MSS. It is universally accepted. Leoprepides is Simonides (Simonid. fr. 146 and 147). It is with the rest of the pentameter that I am concerned.

'Sanguis Aleuae' is Scopas, one of the Aleuadae, who lived at Crannon in Thessaly. The story of the escape of Simonides from death by the intervention of the Dioscuri, when the house of Scopas collapsed, burying its owner in the ruins, is told by Cicero, *de Or.* II. 352: 'Dicunt enim, cum cenaret Crannone in Thessalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem et nobilem cecinissetque id carmen, quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta et Pollucem fuissent, nimis illum sordide Simonidi dixisse se dimidium eius ei, quod pactus esset, pro illo carmine daturum; reliquum a suis Tyndaridis, quos aequae laudasset [cp. Phaedrus IV. 25, 9], peteret, si ei uideretur. paulo post esse ferunt nuntiatum Simonidi, ut prodiret; iuuenis stare ad ianuam duo quosdam, qui eum magno opere euocarent; surrexisse illum, prodisse, uidisse neminem: hoc interim spatio conclaue illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidisse; ea ruina ipsum cum cognatis oppressum suis interisse.'

'Stella' is usually explained as the constellation of the Dioscuri, Gemini. So Micyllus, followed by Salvagnius, Ellis, Ehwald, *Jahresb.* CIX. (1902), p. 287. This explanation is unsatisfactory, for the function of that constellation would appear to have been to promote unity among friends (Manil. II. 629, 'quosque dabunt Chelae Geminique et Aquarius ortus, | unum pectus habent fideique immobile uinclum'), or to save from shipwreck mariners in distress (Hor. *Carm.* IV. 8. 31, 'clarum Tyndaridae sidus ab infimis | quassas eripiunt aequoribus rates'). I do not find that its function was to rescue persons from collapsing houses. Moreover, in the story as told by Cicero and other authorities, Valerius Maximus (I. 8, extern. 7), Phaedrus (IV. 25), Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* XI. 2. 11), and as referred to by Callimachus in lines put



into the mouth of Simonides (fr. 71, Schneider, p. 224), we are told nothing about the constellation of the Dioscuri. It is the Dioscuri themselves who appear miraculously in human form, as 'iuuenes duo' in Cicero, as 'duo iuuenes' in Valerius, as 'duo iuuenes sparsi puluere' in Phaedrus, as 'duo iuuenes equis aduecti' in Quintilian.

Equally unsatisfactory is the conjecture of Mr. Housman, which he has introduced into the text of the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*—'stella Iouis.' He quotes in support of it Hor. *Carm.* II. 17. 22, 'te Iouis impio | tutela Saturno refulgens | eripuit.' There Horace speaks of the benign star of Jupiter in conflict with the malign star of Saturn, intervening to save Maecenas from a dangerous illness. But what has the star of Jupiter here to do with Simonides?

The text requires not emendation, but elucidation. 'Stella' I understand to mean Simonides' own natal star, the star of his good fortune, which rose above the horizon at the moment of his birth. Some were born under an unlucky, some, as presumably Simonides, under a lucky star. Iuu. vii. 194

distat enim quae  
sidera te excipiant modo primos incipientem  
edere uagitus et adhuc a matre rubentem.  
si Fortuna uolet, fies de rhetore consul;  
si uolet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor.  
Ventidius quid enim? quid Tullius? anne aliud quam  
sidus et occulti miranda potentia fati?

Cp. Manil. III. 58 foll. The influence of the natal star is often referred to: so of Ibis Ovid says, 208

natus es infelix, ita di uoluere, nec ulla  
commoda nascenti stella leuius fuit.

Other passages are *Heroid.* viii. 88, 'quodue mihi miserae sidus obesse querar?' *Trist.* V. 10. 45, 'o duram Lachesin, quae tam graue sidus habenti | fila dedit uitae non breuiora meae!' *Prop.* I. 6. 36, 'uiuere me duro sidere certus eris.' II. 27. 4, 'quae sit stella homini commoda quaeque mala.' On the influence of opposing stars see Ovid *Am.* I. 8. 27 foll.; Persius V. 50.

As regards 'uiro' this word is emphatic, 'the illustrious man,' as in Lucret. III. 371, 'Democriti quod sancta uiri sententia ponit'; as to which expression Mr. Housman appropriately says that this Lucretius can write, 'because *uiri* means a right worthy man, like *ἀνδρός* in Soph. *Aiax* 817 and elsewhere (*Classical Review* XV. 264).' I concur, and think that to alter 'uiro' in this line of the *Ibis* is superfluous. For the substantive in apposition to the patronymic cp. *Ibis* 543, 'puer Harpagides.'

Ex PONTO I. i. 65-66

mors faciet certe, ne sim, cum uenerit, exul:  
ne non peccarim mors quoque non faciet.

So the MSS. except that for 'ne non' the Hamburgensis has 'nec non.'

Since Heinsius and Bentley the couplet has been generally condemned. It is true that it repeats the thought of the preceding line

poena potest demi, culpa perennis erit,

and that the same thought is resumed 75-76

nec prius hi mentem stimuli quam uita relinquet :

quique dolet, citius quam dolor ipse, cadet :

but that it is superfluous is no argument against it. Ovid being 'nimium amator ingenii sui' (Quintil. I. 10. 88) is full of redundancy, and the genuineness of the couplet is rightly asserted by Schreuders (*Observationes in Ovidii ex Ponto, Libros I.-III.* Lugd. Bat. 1895, p. 11). Groundless exception has been taken to the trisyllabic verb at the end of the pentameter, for in the Pontic Epistles Ovid does permit himself to end with trisyllabic verbs: I. 8. 40, 'liceat'; III. 5. 40, 'recitent'; 6. 46, 'uideor'; IV. 9. 26, 'tegeret' (see Ehwald, *Krit. Beiträge*, p. 11).

The real crux is 'ne non,' which makes Ovid say the direct opposite of what he means: 'Even death will not cause me not to have not sinned' = 'Even death will not cause me to have sinned,' for the doubled negatives destroy one another. Schreuders defends the expression as a negligence of language, and quotes what Ovid says *ex P. III. 9. 17*

saepe aliquod uerbum cupiens mutare reliqui  
iudicium uires destituuntque meum.

But Ovid cannot have been so negligent as to have failed to distinguish a negative from an affirmative.

Comparing *A. A. II. 101*

non facient, ut uiuat amor, Medeides herbae,

and *ex P. II. 2. 24*

non tamen efficies ut timeare mihi,

I believe that the genuine reading is 'ut non peccarim.' This is supported by the fact that in the Munich MS. 19476, one of the three best MSS., 'ut' is written by the second hand above 'ne' (Korn, *De codd. duobus carm. Ouid. ex P.*, p. 6). The variant may have found its way in through collation with some early MS. The substitution of 'ne' for 'ut' in our MSS. was due to the 'ne' in the preceding line. This is what Havet calls an error due to 'suggestion d'un mot antérieur' (*Manuel de Critique Verbale*, § 496). Reading 'ut' the meaning is: 'Assuredly death, when it comes, will set an end to my exile: even death will not obliterate my offence.'

EX PONTO I. 7. 21-22

quis se Caesaribus notus non fingit amicum ?

da ueniam fasso : tu mihi Cæsar eras.

So the Hamburgensis, and some MSS., while the Munich MSS. and others, have 'eris.' 'Eras' is preferable, meaning 'at the time when I wrote the

compliments that gave you offence, you were my Caesar.' This offence is mentioned line 17

me miserum, si tu uerbis offenderis istis,  
nosque negas ulla parte fuisse tuos!

The flattery by which Ovid speaks of Messalinus as held by him in equal reverence with his sovereign is paralleled by I. 9. 49, where, addressing Celsus, he says that his patron Maximus Cotta was revered by him as if he were a god ('quem tu pro numine uiuus habebas').

Ex PONTO I. 7. 65-66

idque facis, quantumque licet meminisse, solebas  
officii + causa pluribus esse + dari.

So the Hamburgensis and Munich MS. 384. For 'dari' the other MSS. have 'dati.'

The pentameter is so obviously corrupt that Korn rejected it altogether from the text. Various unsuccessful attempts at emendation have been made. The point is that Messalinus is advised to beseech the gods that he may confer more benefits than he has received, which in fact is what he does. To confer rather than to return a favour is what matters. For the unmetrical 'causa' a few MSS. and some editions have 'causam,' which cannot grammatically be construed as predicate after 'solebas.' And yet such a predicate is wanted. This difficulty is removed by Dr. Purser's neat emendation, 'causae' (he reads 'causae—dati'; see Keene, *ad loc.*). Ehwald (*Jahresbericht* LXXX. p. 113) objects to 'causae,' thus used as predicative dative as unovidian. It certainly cannot be defended by *Am.* II. 6. 31

nux erat esca tibi causaeque papauera somni,

doubtfully quoted by Roby, *L. Gr.* II. p. xlii, for in that line 'causae' must be the same case as 'esca,' viz. nominative plural. Parallel uses of 'causae' as predicative dative from other writers are quoted by Roby. But as Ovid can say *ex P.* II. 1. 4

iam minus hic odio est, quam fuit ante, locus

it is clear that he could have used 'causae' as predicative dative.

Accepting therefore Dr. Purser's 'causae,' I propose to read

officii causae pluribus esse datis,

'You are accustomed to be the occasion for devotion by reason of your conferring more gifts than you receive.' The thought goes back to line 64

ut des quam reddas plura precare deos.

As Cicero says, *Off.* I. § 48, there are 'duo genera liberalitatis, unum dandi beneficii, alterum reddendi.' I understand 'datis' as a substantive, like *Met.* VI. 462, 'nec non ingentibus ipsam sollicitare datis.'

## EX PONTO II. 2. 31-38

tuta petant alii. fortuna miserrima tuta est :  
 nam timor euentu deterioris abest.  
 qui rapitur . . . . .  
 porrigit spinas dura quae saxa  
 accipitremque timens pennis trepidantibus ales  
 audet ad humanos fessa uenire sinus,  
 nec se uicino dubitat committere tecto,  
 quae fugit infestos territa cerua canes.

So the passage stands in our best MS., the Hamburgensis, except for the trifling error, 'infesto' for 'infestos.' The mutilated couplet, 'qui rapitur—saxa,' is omitted altogether in the two Munich MSS., though Munich 384 contains an obviously wrong supplement, added by a later hand

qui rapitur fatis quid praeter fata requirat ?  
 saepe creat molles aspera spina rosas.

It is evident that the archetype of these three MSS. was here defaced, and partly illegible. The scribe of the Hamburgensis copied faithfully what he could read, leaving the couplet without metre or sense: the scribes of the Munich MSS. omitted altogether what they could not understand.

In line 32, 'euentu,' the reading of the Hamburgensis and one Munich MS. must be restored in place of the vulgate reading 'euentus' (Ehwald, *Kr. B.*, p. 16). Ovid says: 'The most miserable condition is secure, for it is free from the fear of one worse in its result.' The proposition that the lesser evil is preferable in the face of a still worse contingency is next enforced by three illustrations: (1) That contained in the mutilated couplet; (2) the hunted bird, which prefers to fall into human hands rather than into the clutches of the hawk; (3) the stag which, rather than be caught by the hounds, flees into a house.

Now it is characteristic of Ovid to exemplify a proposition by three illustrations. Thus, *ex P. II. 5. 61*

rusticus agricolam, miles fera bella gerentem,  
 rectorem dubiae nauita puppis amat.

## II. 7. 9

qui semel est laesus fallaci piscis ab hamo,  
 omnibus unca cibus aera subesse putat.  
 saepe canem longe uisum fugit agna lupumque  
 credit, et ipsa suam nescia uitat opem.  
 membra reformidant mollem quoque saucia tactum,  
 uanaque sollicitis incutit umbra metum.

Thus in *Am. I. 2. 9* the statement that it is best for one in love not to attempt resistance is exemplified by three illustrations: fire, which dies out if left undisturbed; oxen, which when tamed are beaten less than those which struggle before they have been tamed; and the unbroken horse, whose mouth

is galled more by the bit than when he has been broken. Thus in *A. A. II. 177* the statement that woman's heart must be won by gentleness, not by compulsion, is exemplified by three illustrations: the crooked branch, which may be straightened by patience, but is broken by the use of force; the swimmer, who succeeds by swimming with the stream; and wild animals, which are tamed by patience, not by force. Thus in the *Medicamina faciei* 37 the statement that simples are useless for the complexion is exemplified by three illustrations: spells cannot split snakes, nor make streams flow backward, nor bring down the moon.

I conclude therefore that the mutilated couplet cannot be dealt with by mere omission. It clearly contained the first in a series of three illustrations. Its missing portions are excellently restored in the version of it found in the Leipzig and Erfurt MSS.

qui rapitur spumante salo, sua brachia tendens  
porrigit ad spinas duraque saxa manus.

For 'salo' the Erfurt MS. has 'freto.' If this be accepted, the first of Ovid's three illustrations is a man carried away by the surge, who prefers to clutch at thorns and rough rocks rather than be drowned.

I suspect that this couplet was preserved in some very ancient MS., which was collated by the scribes of the Leipzig and Erfurt MSS., who thence supplied it into their text. It is known that such collation of ancient MSS. did take place in the scriptoria. The preservation of the supplementary lines at Juvenal vi. 365 is due no doubt to this factor. The lines are preserved in the Oxford MS. alone, which was written in the Beneventan script, probably at Monte Cassino. It is probable that in that library some very early MS. of Juvenal was preserved containing these lines, which Leo plausibly argues formed part of the poet's first edition, and were suppressed in the second. The *Heroides* of Ovid offer further confirmation of this hypothesis. It has been pointed out by Vahlen (*Ueber die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid*) that whereas *Heroides* I, II, III, IV, XIII, XIV all begin with a couplet in which the name of the writer of the epistle is given, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII begin abruptly without mention of the writer. There are three chief MSS. of the *Heroides*; Parisinus, sec. xi, Guelferbytanus, sec. xii, both Frankish MSS., written in Caroline minuscules, and the Eton MS., sec. xi, written in the Beneventan script, probably at Monte Cassino. It is an extraordinary fact that the desiderated couplets, containing the writer's name, are supplied at the beginning of V, VI, VII in the Eton MS. I suggest that the scribe of the Eton MS. had access to some very early MS., such as may well have been preserved in a South Italian library, by collation with which he supplied these couplets.<sup>1</sup> It should also be mentioned that the missing couplets in VIII, IX, X, XI, XII are supplied in certain later MSS., which may have got them from a similar source. If these supplementary couplets be accepted, we

<sup>1</sup> I base this suggestion on the valuable essay p. 895.  
of P. von Winterfeld, *Gött. gel. Anzeige*, 1899,

NOT

have  
shoul  
posed  
easy  
omitt  
filled  
line  
begin  
first  
VI b  
with

has  
S  
that  
theref  
further  
Mart.  
staine  
in the  
infesti  
Senec

Thoug  
the en  
if the  
It  
less, a  
epithe  
have  
tortuo  
was f  
and  
by M  
V. 10

<sup>1</sup> Th  
Sedlm



have in the *Heroides* complete uniformity of structure, which is what we should expect to find in these elaborate poetical 'suasoriae,' which are composed methodically according to the strict rules of ancient rhetoric. It was easy for a couplet to fall out at the beginning of a poem: it may have been omitted, for instance, with a view to rubrication, and then have never been filled in: it may have been omitted at the beginning of V because the last line of IV and the first line of V both begin with 'Perlegis,' and at the beginning of XI, because the last line of X begins with 'si prius' and the first line of XI with 'siqua': it may have been omitted at the beginning of VI because the supplementary couplet begins with 'Lemnias,' and VI. 1 with 'Litora.'<sup>1</sup>

## EX PONTO II. 8. 53

Caesaris aduentu tuta gladiator harena  
exit, et auxilium non leue uulnus habet.

For 'aduentu' the Hamburgensis has 'aduentum,' and for 'tuta' it has 'tota.'

Schreuders objects to 'aduentu' because he says that it is not recorded that on the arrival of Augustus at the podium gladiators were spared. He therefore accepts Riese's conjecture, 'ad nutum,' followed by Ehwald, who further proposes to alter 'tuta' to 'tincta,' 'the blood-stained sand,' comparing Mart. II. 75. 6, 'sanguineam humum.' But 'tincta' could not mean 'blood-stained' unless 'sanguine' were added. I think the passage is to be explained in the light of the statement of Suetonius, Iul. 26, 'gladiatores notos, sicubi infestis spectatoribus dimicarent, ni rapiendos reseruandosque mandabat,' and Seneca in *Anth. Lat.* P.L.M. (Baehrens) IV. 25, 27 (p. 66)

sperat et in saeua uictus gladiator harena,  
sit licet infesto pollice turba minax.

Though the fate of the defeated gladiator depended generally on the people, the emperor might specially intervene to save him. This would only happen if the emperor was personally present.

It remains to consider the readings 'tuta' and 'tota.' 'Tota' is pointless, and will not do. 'Tuta' can only be explained as a case of transferred epithet, as Fabricius explained it, 'pro ipse gladiator tutus.' But as it would have been simpler to say 'tutus gladiator' outright, this seems peculiarly tortuous. Therefore I propose to read 'tuto,' the termination of which word was falsely assimilated to 'harena' by a species of error which is frequent, and has been treated by Havet, *Manuel de Critique Verbale*, ch. xxiv, and by Mr. Hall, *Companion*, p. 174. Ovid uses 'tuto' in *Am.* II. 14. 43; *Trist.* V. 10. 39.

<sup>1</sup> The supplementary couplets are given in and in Ehwald's Teubner text. Sedlmayer's critical edition, in Palmer's edition,

## EX PONTO III. 3. 41

at non Chionides Eumolpus in Orpheia talis.

Eumolpus was son of Posidon and Chione (Apollodor. III. 15. 4). Though in Chione the first syllable is short (Met. XI. 301), in Chionides it is lengthened through stress, according to the principle which I have illustrated, *Classical Quarterly*, VIII. 29.

## EX PONTO III. 4. 89

inrita uotorum non sunt praesagia uatum.

Ehwald (*Kr. Beitr.* p. 48) justly defends 'uotorum' against alterations such as 'motorum' (Heinsius) and others which will be found recorded in my note in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. 'The prophecies,' says Ovid, 'of poets are not vain in respect of their prayers,' the things for which they pray. It should be pointed out that just as the words 'praesagia' and 'uatum' are picked up lower down in 'praedico' and 'uaticinor,' line 94

haec duce praedico uaticinorque deo,

so 'uotorum' is picked up in 'precor,' line 114:

uerba, precor, celeri nostra probate fide.

## EX PONTO III. 4. 107-108

squalidus inmissos fracta sub harundine crines  
Rhenus et infectas sanguine portet aquas.

So the text stands in some MSS. The Hamburgensis, which ends at III. 2. 67, is here wanting. For 'portet' the Munich MS. 384 has 'potat,' the Munich MS. 19476 'portat'; a few have 'portet,' accepted by Korn. Ehwald (*Kr. B.* p. 82), after successfully refuting the absurd conjecture of Merkel, 'porgat,' objects to 'portet' because he says that the verb required must fit both 'crines' and 'aquas,' which this does not. He proposes 'monstret.' A subjunctive is of course required. But I think that 'portet' is right. The image of the river-god exhibited in the triumph (Plin. *N. H.* V. 37; Tac. *A.* II. 41, 'uecta spolia, captiui, simulacra montium, fluminum, proeliorum'), must have carried a vessel containing blood-stained water. Thus he is said to carry both his hair and this vessel.

## EX PONTO III. 5. 49

hac ubi perueni nulli cernendus in urbem.

The Vulgate reading 'nulli' is preferable to that of the Munich MSS. 'nullis,' since the plural of 'nullus' as a substantive is very rare (Reisig, *Vorlesung. lat. Sprachw.* III<sup>2</sup>, p. 73), though Ovid has *Met.* VIII. 172, 'nullis iterata priorum ianua.'

## EX PONTO IV. 4. 27-34

cernere iam uideor rumpi paene atria turba,  
 et populum laedi deficiente loco,  
 templaque Tarpeiae primum tibi sedis adiri,  
 et fieri faciles in tua uota deos,  
 colla boues niueos certae praebere securi,  
 quos aluit campis herba Falisca suis,  
 cumque deos omnes, tunc hos inpensius, aequos  
 esse tibi cupias, cum Ioue Caesar erunt.

Sextus Pompeius is addressed, who is entering at Rome on his consulship. In line 31 the asyndeton at 'colla,' for which 'collaque' is demanded by the context, is so awkward that Ehwald (*Kr. B.* p. 64) suggests that a couplet has fallen out after line 32, and that a new period begins at line 31. I propose as a less drastic remedy to read 'cerno' for 'certae' in line 31, thus providing a verb to introduce 'praebere.' 'Cerno,' 'I see in imagination,' is like 'uideo,' 'I see in imagination,' III. 5. 47

te nisi momentis uideo paene omnibus absens.

There is little point in the epithet 'certae,' which adjective is not elsewhere in Ovid applied to 'securis.' In *Met.* XV. 126, 'percussit colla securi.' *Fast.* IV. 415, 'apta iugo ceruix non est ferienda securi' there is no epithet. 'Certa' is common as applied to 'hasta' and 'sagitta' because one might miss with those weapons, but the sacrificial slaughterer would not be expected to miss his victim.

In line 33 I accept 'tunc hos' from Korn's Paris MS. 7993 in place of 'tum quos,' the reading of the rest, translating, 'And since you desire the favour of all the gods, and at that moment the favour of these two especially, Jupiter and Caesar will be present.' 'Tunc' refers to the prayers offered at the time of the sacrifice of the oxen (line 31), as opposed to the prayers offered to all the gods ('deos omnes') in line 30 ('faciles in tua uota deos'). In this explanation put forward by Ehwald (*Kr. B.* p. 64) I concur, but I think he is wrong in understanding 'hos' of the Capitoline deities: it refers rather to Jupiter and Caesar, the two chief gods in Ovid's parlance, whom he often joins together, e.g. *Trist.* II. 39.

In the last line, 'erunt,' the reading of the Munich MSS., is preferable to the Vulgate 'erit,' because it is idiomatic to use a plural verb with a singular nominative joined to a substantive with 'cum.' *Met.* IV. 734, 'litora cum plausu clamor superasque deorum inpleuere domos.' So in prose, *Liv.* XXI. 60, 'ipse dux cum aliquot principibus capiuntur.' Cp. *Fast.* IV. 54, 'Ilia cum Lauso de Numitore sati.'

## EX PONTO IV. 8. 85

clausaque si misero patria est, ut ponar in ullo,  
 qui minus Ausonia distet ab urbe, loco.

For 'distet' the Munich and some other MSS. have 'distat,' which

Ehwald (*Kr. B.* p. 64) proposes to restore. But the subjunctive is required by attraction after 'ponar': cp. *I. 7. 13*: 'nos habeat regio nec poma feta nec uuis, et cuius nullum cesset ab hoste latus.' So *IV. 10. 71*. Indicatives and subjunctives are so constantly confused in Ovid's MSS. that judgement in each case must decide what is right. See my *Tristia*, Prolegg. p. lxxvii.

# EX PONTO IV. 16.

This interesting poem, in which Ovid enumerates the contemporary poets, is fully commented on by Schanz, *Röm. lit.* II. 1, p. 360 foll.

The poem consists of two propositions: (1) 'Before my exile, while I was a poet recognised by society, I had reputation' (lines 1-4). (2) 'And at the time when there was Marsus and all the rest of the galaxy of poets enumerated, my poetry was celebrated and read, though so many distinguished authors were writing besides myself. Therefore, now that I am fallen, I should not be defamed' (5-52).

The construction of 45-46

dicere si fas est, claro mea nomine Musa  
atque inter tantos quae legeretur, erat.

is 'Mea Musa erat claro nomine atque erat Musa quae inter tantos legeretur.'

The punctuation of the poem is unsatisfactory in the editions. At line 4 there should be a full stop at 'erat.' At line 5 begins a long series of protases, each contained in a couplet, or sometimes in a single line. There should be a semicolon at the end of each couplet, till lines 41-44, 'te tamen—dedit,' which should be placed in a parenthesis, since the verb changes from past, 'cum foret,' etc., to present, 'non ausim silere.' 'Among the many poets,' says Ovid, 'I cannot forget to mention you, Cotta.' The parenthesis is suggested by 'adpellandorum' in line 40. At line 45 the apodosis is introduced, and the full stop comes at 'erat.'

There is much difficulty as to 33-34

Tityron antiquas † passerque rediret ad herbas,  
aptaque uenanti Grattius arma daret.

Line 33 is corrupt: some of the solutions proposed, none in my opinion satisfactory, are given by Schanz, *Röm. Lit.*, l.c. p. 355. The whole couplet appears to allude to the poet Grattius, the pentameter to his *Cynegetica*, in direct reference to the words of Grattius, line 22

lusus

carmine et arma dabo et uenandi persequar artis.

The corrupt hexameter is by many, as by Schanz, supposed to refer to a lost Bucolica by Grattius. This seems to me to be the most probable hypothesis. Accepting it, I propose to read

Tityron antiquas pastorem exciret ad herbas.

'Cum' is understood from line 31 two lines above. Grattius summoned

Tityrus t  
herbas').

This  
inscribed  
its title v  
'Versus  
'Halieuti  
*Halieutica*  
the exiled  
to and cit  
XXXII.

The opin  
of a later  
made up  
incredible  
Ovid, and  
poem.  
irrelevant  
and has  
*Abhandlun*

I qu  
'In  
es ist da  
Ovid das  
Tod an d  
*der römisc*

'Le  
à discuter  
Zingerle

It mu  
that, as it  
nature of  
the perfec  
probably

In t  
attention  
'Those v  
must eith  
feature w

1 'Mihi  
didit pisci

Tityrus to take his place once more on the old world pastures ('antiquas herbas'), pastures sung by poets of long ago. For 'antiquas' cp. *A. A.* III. 405

cura deum fuerunt olim regumque poetae,  
praemiaque antiqui magna tulere chori.

## HALIEVTICA.

This short didactic poem on fishes, cited by Pliny as *Halieuticon*,<sup>1</sup> is inscribed 'Versus Ouidi de piscibus et feris' in the Vienna MS. Probably its title was *Halieuticon Liber*, as that of Grattius is *Cynegeticon Liber*, and 'Versus Ouidi de piscibus et feris' may conceal an alternative title, thus, 'Halieuticon liber siue de piscibus et feris.' It cannot be questioned that the *Halieutica* is the genuine work of Ovid, a trifle with the composition of which the exiled poet amused himself at the close of his life. The precise references to and citations from the poem as we have it which are found in Pliny (*N. H.* XXXII. § 11-13 and § 152-153) preclude any doubt as to its authenticity. The opinions that have been advanced to the contrary, that it is the work of a later poet which Pliny mistook for that of Ovid, or that it is a forgery made up from Pliny's quotations, cannot be seriously maintained. It is incredible that Pliny could have mistaken the work of another for that of Ovid, and no forger could have been ingenious enough to have forged this poem. The sceptical view has been supported with much minute, often irrelevant learning, by Birt, *De Halieuticis Ouidio poetae falso adscriptis* (1878), and has been refuted, amongst others, by A. Zingerle, *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen* II. pp. 1-44, and F. Vollmer, *Rhein. Mus.* LV. pp. 528-530.

I quote two recent judgements on the matter by two consummate critics :

'In dem Zustand, in dem wir die Schrift haben, lag sie auch Plinius vor; es ist daher ein Zweifel an ihrer Echtheit vollständig ausgeschlossen. Da Ovid das Gedicht in der letzten Zeit seines Exils verfasste, wird er durch den Tod an der Vollendung desselben verhindert worden sein.' Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, II. 1, p. 338.

'Le reste n'ajoute rien aux titres d'Ovide et ne vaut pas que l'on s'attarde à discuter l'opinion de Birt contre l'authenticité, opinion réfutée d'ailleurs par Zingerle et par Bährens.' Plessis, *La Poésie Latine*, p. 461.

It must be assumed that we have in this poem the genuine work of Ovid, but that, as it was written at the end of his life and not finally completed, it is of the nature of a rough draught. It is therefore likely to contain things at variance with the perfection found in the best works of the great artist, and and which he would probably have removed, if he had lived. And this in fact is what we do find.

In the *Classical Quarterly*, I. pp. 275 sqq., Mr. Housman has drawn attention to certain irregularities in the prosody of the poem. He says: 'Those who believe that Ovid wrote the halieutica, or that Pliny read it, must either renounce their beliefs or else find means to rid the poem of a feature which renders both alike incredible: its false quantities.'

<sup>1</sup> 'Mihi uidentur mira et quae Ouidius prodidit piscium ingenia in eo uolumine quod Halieuticon inscribitur.' Plin. *N. H.* XXXII. § 11.



As I believe that Ovid wrote the *Halientica*, I propose to consider these irregularities.

First, there is the scansion of 'milui' as a disyllable, line 95

hippuri ceteres et nigro tergore milui,

of which, says Mr. Housman, 'the first certain example is some forty years later than Pliny's death and a whole century later than Ovid's: Iuu. ix. 55, 'tot miluos intra tua pascua lassas.' Synizesis is indeed used seldom by Ovid, and is generally of a normal character as 'cōnūbiō' (*Met.* VI. 428), 'aūreō' (*H.* vi. 49). More unusual are 'Āntiūm' (*Met.* XV. 718), 'ārcuātō' (*Met.* XI. 590). It is probable that this scansion of 'milui' is one of those roughnesses which Ovid would have removed if he had lived. His scansion of 'arcuato' shows that such synizesis was possible to him: and Ovid's scansion 'milui' may have influenced Juvenal. The fact that the word 'larua,' trisyllabic in Plautus, became a disyllable in classical Latin, and that 'tenuis' is sometimes three and sometimes two syllables shows that Ovid would have found no difficulty in scanning 'miluus' as a disyllable (see Lindsay, *Lat. Language*, p. 46). He may well have started it. Things must begin somewhere.

Secondly, there is the scansion of 'anthias' as a dactyl in line 46

anthias his, tergo quae non uidet, utitur armis.

I agree with Mr. Housman that the word cannot be scanned as a spondee, since such synizesis in dealing with a Greek word was for a Roman poet impossible. I disagree with him when he denies that it can be a dactyl. Everybody knows that in Greek it is a cretic. But Ovid, located in exile on the Black Sea, when writing of fishes, may well have drawn his knowledge from local fishermen, Greek settlers who spoke the local vulgar Greek dialect, by no means the same as classical Greek. The importance of the fish trade of the Black Sea made its fishermen not negligible authorities.<sup>1</sup> The poet may well have preserved the pronunciation of his informants.

The shortening of long vowels is an obvious indication of the vulgar dialect (Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, p. 75). Even in classical Latin the long -as and -es of Greek substantives tended to become ā; thus 'Perdiccas' and 'sycophantes' became 'Perdicca' and 'sycophanta' (Roby, *L. Gr.*, i. p. 163). It is probable enough that ἀνθίας became shortened in its final syllable in the vulgar dialect. In fact, even Quicherat's suggestion is not impossible: 'Velim esse Anthiās, ādos, nisi obsit graeca uox' (*Thesaurus Poeticus*, p. 77). Ovid does complain that he lives in an environment of alien tongues, *Trist.* III. 14. 47

Threicio Scythicoque fere circumsonor ore;

and from *ex Ponto* III. 9. 17

saepe aliquod uerbum cupiens mutare reliqui,

iudicium uires destituuntque meum.

saepe piget (quid enim dubitem tibi uera fateri?)

corrigere et longi ferre laboris onus,

<sup>1</sup> Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 440. Plin., *N. H.* XXXII. § 152, 'his adiciemus ab Ouidio posita animalia, quae apud neminem alium reperi-

untur, sed fortassis in Ponto nascentia, ubi id uolumen supremis suis temporibus inchoauit.'

it is evident  
ex P. I. 5.

Third  
in line 103

the name  
fr. 1. 1; C  
'mormyre

the name  
μορμύρον  
of the ab  
Black Sea  
I am sail  
different v  
The spell

I con  
*Halientica*  
of these  
them; for  
find in th  
neglected  
came to s  
βαλανεῖον  
(Strab.) a  
to the vu  
origin has  
τρίχες in  
as a trib  
"three"  
pronuncia

HALI

Birt  
fluos,' a  
anaphora  
(*Rh. Mus.*  
by readin  
paring P

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay  
etymology of

it is evident that towards the end of his life he wrote less carefully. See also *ex P. I.* 5. 3 foll., and Zingerle, *Kl. ph. Abhandl.* II., p. 41.

Thirdly, there is the strange false quantity 'pompile' as an antibacchius in line 101

qui semper spumas sequeris, pompile, nitentes,

the name of which fish, *πομπίλος*, is a dactyl in Greek poets (Erinna, fr. 1. 1; Oppian, *Hal.* I. 186), and there is the equally strange antibacchius 'mormyres' in 110

et rarus faber et pictae mormyres et auri,

the name of which fish in Greek is *μορμύρος*, a dactyl, Anth. Pal. VI. 304. 4, *μορμύρον ἢ κίχλην ἢ σπάρον ἢ σμαρίδα*. In both these cases I see the influence of the abnormal pronunciation of the semi-barbarous Greek fishermen of the Black Sea. Such influences are always at work in language. If I say that I am sailing for the port of Genoa I pronounce the name of that city in a different way to that which I use in ordering Genoa cake of a pastrycook. The spell of the pastrycook's tongue is then upon me.

I conclude therefore that the evidence of Pliny for the authenticity of the *Halieutica* is overwhelming. It cannot be declared to be unovidian on account of these metrical peculiarities. They are there; there is more than one of them; for this there must be a common cause. This cause I am content to find in the influence of vulgar Greek pronunciation, a factor which cannot be neglected in dealing with Latin literature. It came upon Latin early, and came to stay. Thus *ἄγκυρα* appears in Latin as *anchōra*, *βράχιον* as *brachium*, *βαλανεῖον* as *balinēum*, *balnēum*, *πλατεῖα* as *platēa*, *Σήωνες* (Polyb.) *Οὔασκωνες* (Strab.) as *Sēnōnes*, *Vascōnes*. Thus the Plautine *Accheruns*, *Acchilles* are due to the vulgar Greek pronunciation of *χ* as *k-kh*; and 'the word *trīcae*, whose origin has been traced to South Italy . . . seems to be nothing but the Greek *τρίχες* in a Latinized form.'<sup>1</sup> Thus the coin *Philippus* 'is always scanned as a tribrach in Plautus, just as we tolerate a mispronunciation of the word "three" in "threepence." But the name *Philippus* . . . has the "literary" pronunciation.'<sup>2</sup>

#### HALIEVT. 2

uitulus sic namque minatur

qui nondum gerit in tenera iam cornua fronte.

sic dammae fugiunt.

Birt (*Halieut.*, p. 13) objects to 'sic namque' because 'namque' is superfluous, and 'sic' without it would be more natural, as producing the figure anaphora, 'uitulus sic—sic dammae—sic scorpius—leuis sic ales,' and Vollmer (*Rh. Mus.* LV. 528), following the same line of criticism, removes the difficulty by reading 'manca' for 'namque' (he prints 'manca' in his edition), comparing Prudent. *Peristeph.* II. 231, 'errorque mancum claudicat,' and expres-

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay, *Lat. Language*, p. 58. Another given in Walde, *Lat. etymol. Wörterbuch*, p. 791. etymology of 'trīcae' besides that of Lindsay is

<sup>2</sup> Lindsay, *Captivi of Plautus* (1900), p. 24.

sions like *Copa* 3, 'saltat lasciuu.' It is a far cry from Ovid to Prudentius. Ovid uses the uncommon word 'mancus' once only, *Fast.* III. 826

et licet antiquo manibus conlatus Epeo  
sit prior, irata Pallade mancus erit.

Though a carpenter be more skilful than Epeus, if Pallas be unfavourable, he will lose the use of his hands, be powerless. The word is there used in its strict sense, with relation to the loss of a limb, the hands. But the calf that has not yet grown any horns could hardly be said to have lost them. Therefore I think 'manca minatur' is inappropriate, and could be used only of a calf that had been divested of its horns.

'Namque' on the other hand, is appropriate as introducing the series of illustrations of the proposition that the world has received its law. It has distributed arms among all creatures, and made them careful of self-preservation. For the calf which as yet has grown no horns makes believe to strike.

'Namque' is placed third word as *Met.* II. 474, 'adimam tibi namque figuram.' XIV. 312, 'cum duce namque meo Circe dum sola moratur.' Verg. *Aen.* I. 444, Kühner, *L. Gr.*, II. 715. 'Namque' is the certain conjecture of Sannazarius, which is usually accepted, for 'manuq'; the reading of the Vienna MS. The corruption 'manuque' is an instance of multiplication of letters, a common source of error in MSS., possibly due to the mispronunciation of the scribe. The same error appears in the Vienna MS. at 26, 'atque' for 'atque'; 49, 'et cetera' for 'cetera'; 60, 'denuntiate' for 'denuntiat'; 70, 'aurate' for 'aurae'; 114, 'merolateque' for 'merulaeque'; 124, 'soleate' for 'soleae,' which examples I take from Haupt's apparatus Criticus (*Halieut.*, Lips., 1838). The same error appears often in the MSS. of Catullus, as I have pointed out in my note on Catull. 116. 7, as 63. 5, 'iletas' for 'ili'; 64. 3, 'Fasidicos' for 'Phasidos'; 66. 6, 'guioclero' for 'guro.'

The calf attempting to butt with hornless brow is a commonplace. *Ov. Am.* III. 13. 15

et uituli nondum metuenda fronte minaces.

Iuuen. xii. 7

quippe ferox uitulus . . . . .

. . . qui uexat nascenti robora cornu.

Mart. III. 58. 11

uitulusque inermi fronte prurit in pugnam.

VI. 38. 8

sic uitulus molli proelia fronte cupit.

Claud. IV., *Cons. Honor.* 383

sic pascua paruus

uindicat et necdum firmatis cornibus audax

iam regit armentum uitulus.

But though the calf is said to butt, and to butt having no horns, he is not said to butt ineffectively. For Ovid's 'nondum metuenda fronte' is only another

way of  
Vollmer

Bir  
'iam' v  
amplius,  
to 'tene  
and 'mo  
'iamque

HA

In  
'quomq  
tion as  
destruct  
*Hist.* I.  
und Stil

HA

Mr.  
conjectu  
'Capto'  
timorem  
gaudia'  
eagernes  
which m  
which m

HA

Ovi  
because  
'cupiunt  
means '  
laetiore,

way of putting Martial's 'inermi fronte.' For these reasons I cannot accept Vollmer's 'manca.'

Birt further objects to 'iam,' which he takes with 'nondum' because 'iam' when compounded with an adverb of negation is equivalent to 'non amplius,' which is 'contrarium uoci *nondum*.' This is futile, for 'iam' belongs to 'tenera,' 'his brow now tender'; it means the same as Martial's 'inermi' and 'molli fronte.' 'Iam' is often joined with an adjective, as Iuu. iii. 206, 'iamque uetus cista'; xi. 127, 'iam nimios capitique graues.'

## HALIEVT. 53-57

inpiger ecce leo uenantum sternere pergit  
agmina et aduersis infert sua pectora telis,  
quoque uenit fidens magis et sublatur ardet  
concussitque toros et uiribus addidit iram,  
procidit atque suo properat sibi robore letum.

In line 55 'quo' means 'in proportion as.' It should not be altered into 'quomque,' as by Schenkl, followed by Vollmer. The meaning is 'in proportion as he advances with more confidence and rages with more spirit, he meets destruction sooner.' For the omission of 'eo' answering to 'quo,' cp. Tac. *Hist. I. 14*, 'quo suspectior sollicitis, adoptanti placebat' (see Dräger, *Syntax und Stil des Tacitus*, § 181).

## HALIEVT. 65

et capto fugiens ceruus sine fine timore.

Mr. Edwards, in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, prints 'cauto,' the conjecture of Heinsius, without remark, as though it were the MS. reading. 'Capto' is the reading of the Vienna MS., and should not be altered. 'Capere timorem' means 'to conceive fear,' like 'capere spem' (*Fast. II. 334*), 'capere gaudia' (*Trist. V. 8. 21*). It is strange that so learned a scholar as Birt, in his eagerness to defend it, should cite in its support 'capere iram' (*Met. VI. 610*), which means 'to restrain one's rage,' and 'capere animos' (*A. A. III. 557*), which means 'to captivate the affections,' phrases which are quite irrelevant.

## HALIEVT. 67

nam capiunt animis palmam gaudentque triumpho.

Ovid is speaking of the noble instinct of horses. Birt objects to 'capiunt' because 'animis nemo facile coronam prehenderit.' He therefore conjectures 'cupiunt' (*Halieut.*, p. 23), which Gütthling accepts. But 'capiunt animis' means 'understand in their minds,' viz. appreciate, as Liv. IX. 9. 14, 'somnio laetiore, quam quod mentes eorum capere possent.'

S. G. OWEN.

## NOTES ON THE *NATVRALES QVAESTIONES* OF SENECA

A NEW text of the *Naturales Quaestiones*, prepared by A. Gercke, was issued by the Teubner Press in 1907. Thirteen years earlier Gercke had, in his *Seneca-Studien*, prepared the way for a new recension by an elaborate classification of the MSS. An Appendix to the *Seneca-Studien* is the *Studia Annaeana* (1900), now unfortunately out of print. These works are an indispensable introduction to the study of the text; and they have cost their author an amount of labour which it would be ungracious to utilize, as I propose to utilize it, without very ample recognition. In what follows I shall be largely occupied in criticizing Gercke. I wish, therefore, to begin by allowing the immense debt under which he has put all students of the *Naturales Quaestiones*. His classification of the MSS. is in itself a fine achievement, and not, I conceive, likely to be challenged. Gercke has, moreover, a very fair perception of the *relative* merits of his numerous MSS. He has, for example, done excellent service in exposing the inferior character of what used to be regarded as our primary authority for the text, the Berlin MS. *E*. He cherishes, again, no delusions about the rather perplexing Geneva MS. *Z*. He has rightly called attention to the paramount importance of the Paris MS. *H*. I fancy, indeed, that if he and I were to place the codices which he enumerates in an order of merit there would not be any great disagreement between us. I differ from Gercke, in fact, not upon the question which MSS. are the best, but upon the hardly less important question which are essential for criticism. I should be inclined to say of Gercke, in a word, that he was a good critic but not a good editor. He cannot persuade himself to leave on one side what has cost labour, or what has been achieved by ingenuity. He crowds his apparatus with the variants of MSS. which he knows to be interpolated at all points—exactly as he crowds it with emendations of which more than half are at the least very improbable. Gercke discovered early—as any one must—that Seneca has always been remissly read, and that he has been left to second-rate critics. Having himself an alert, and even captious, mind, he has been able by a close attention to discover not only a great many hitherto unregarded faults in the text, but also the true remedies for some of these. But he sows with the sack and not with the hand, so that together with not a few brilliant corrections, he has introduced into both text and notes, numberless conjectures

NOT

which a  
that he  
without  
nearly e  
and even  
that it is  
are ofte  
had rea  
had supp  
more th  
perhaps  
time I in  
poor cri

Ger

Both cla  
29-30 of  
'einen s  
the stren  
true, the  
with the  
them bel  
ever in a  
plain, th  
the  $\Delta$  c  
revision  
exempt f  
upon str  
authority  
the other  
by Gerck  
offers thi

fulg  
atio est e

The  
as thoug

<sup>1</sup> 1, 1, 12  
reddant  $\Phi$ .  
1, 5, 7 reli  
quo  $\Phi$ . *ib*.  
quid eas u  
a uero  $\Phi$ .  
transilit  $\Delta$ .  
 $\Delta$ , re (-de co  
 $\Delta$ , populis  $\Phi$   
sentence re



which are unnecessary, confusing, and irritating. I would say, in passing, that he has no notion at all of framing an apparatus that can be followed without a close attention of mind. The form of his notes is so cramped that nearly every important note has to be read twice before it can be understood, and even then the report of readings (and of emendations) is given so obscurely that it is sometimes impossible to discover what is meant. The symbols used are often not explained, nor are they even used consistently throughout. I had read two books before I discovered that the symbol *Ge.* stood, not, as I had supposed, for a late MS., but for Gercke himself—even this remains no more than a brilliant guess! Who, or what, *Wim.* and *Bong.* are, I shall perhaps never know—nor yet the distinction between *Fort.* (which for a long time I interpreted as *fortasse*) and *Fortun.*, *Schult.*, and *Schultess* (both of them poor critics in general).

Gercke divides the MSS. into two main classes, which he calls  $\Delta$  and  $\Phi$ . Both classes he regards as essential for the reconstitution of the text. On pp. 29-30 of his *Seneca-Studien* he raises the question whether the  $\Delta$  class can claim 'einen selbständigen Werth.' This question is answered in the affirmative on the strength of thirteen passages of the first book in which the  $\Delta$  class offer a true, the  $\Phi$  class a false, reading. It might be thought that I ought to deal with these passages one by one; but it will, I think, be sufficient if I give them below in a footnote,<sup>1</sup> and I merely ask the reader to consider whether he ever in any MS. saw thirteen more obvious examples of 'emendation.' To be plain, the matter is not worth discussing. For Gercke himself admits that the  $\Delta$  class has been everywhere subjected to a thorough-going process of revision and interpolation. How, then, he can think these thirteen passages exempt from the suspicion of interpolation passes belief.<sup>2</sup> He would have been upon stronger ground if he had based the claim of these MSS. to independent authority on two passages where they supply, or seem to supply, a lacuna in the other class of codices. These passages are cited, for a different purpose, by Gercke, on p. 35 of the *Studien*. The first is 2, 12, 1, where the  $\Phi$  class offers this:

fulguratio ostendit ignem, fulminatio emittit; illa, ut ita dicam, comminatio est et conatio sine ictu.

The  $\Delta$  class add the words *ista iaculatio sine ictu*. At first glance it looks as though these words had been lost from  $\Phi$  by haplography (*ictu . . . ictu*)

<sup>1</sup> 1, 1, 15 coire  $\Delta$ , ire  $\Phi$ ; 1, 5, 5 reddunt  $\Delta$ , reddant  $\Phi$ . *ib.* unaquaque  $\Delta$ , unaquaeque  $\Phi$ . 1, 5, 7 reliqua  $\Delta$ , aliqua  $\Phi$ . 1, 6, 1 quod  $\Delta$ , quo  $\Phi$ . *ib.* poterunt  $\Delta$ , potuerunt  $\Phi$ . 1, 11, 1 quid eas uocem  $\Delta$ , quid eas  $\Phi$ . 1, 13, 1 uera  $\Delta$ , a uero  $\Phi$ . 1, 13, 3 autem  $\Delta$ , enim  $\Phi$ . 1, 14, 4 transilit  $\Delta$ , transtulit  $\Phi$ . 1, 15, 2 diminutionem  $\Delta$ , re (-de *corr.*) minutionem  $\Phi$ . 1, 15, 7 speculis  $\Delta$ , populis  $\Phi$  (not unimpressive: the rest of the sentence re-written by an interpolator, however,

in  $\Delta$ !). *ib.* exciperentur  $\Delta$ , erip(erip-*corr.*) erentur  $\Phi$ . *Praef.* 8 and 1, 15, 4 I omit since there the advantage lies wholly with  $\Phi$ . (1, 15, 4, indeed, Gercke must be supposed to have included by an accident.)

<sup>2</sup> He cites nothing from Books ii.-vii.; but it would not, I think, help him much if he did, though he could easily have found more convincing passages.

and faithfully preserved in  $\Delta$ ; and it is certain that something has been lost. Yet I feel sure that the supplement in  $\Delta$  is merely conjectural. Not only is the combination *illā . . . ista*—for *illā . . . haec*—so far as I am aware, without example; not only is *iaculatio* a word not elsewhere employed by Seneca; but—and this is what seems to me decisive—the supplement offered by  $\Delta$  is, in itself, inadequate, for the reason that Seneca must, in the words that have been lost, have said something about *tonitrua*. For the sentence which Gercke quotes is immediately preceded by this sentence (which he has, accidentally, suppressed):

tria sunt quae accidunt: fulgurationes, fulmina, tonitrua quae una facta serius audiuntur.

Something, therefore, must have been added about *tonitrua*: and  $\Delta$  does not supply us with what has been lost, but at best only with a part of it; and it is most natural, in view of the extensive interpolations in other parts of these MSS. (interpolations which Gercke is as ready to recognize as I am), to regard this part as a purely conjectural supplement.

The other passage where  $\Delta$  supply a lacuna is 2, 33:

nunc ad fulmina reuertamur, quorum ars in haec tria diuiditur: quemadmodum interpretemur, quemadmodum exploremus.

The casual reader will say at once, 'Where is the third of the three divisions mentioned?' It is lost in  $\Phi$ . But  $\Delta$  adds *quemadmodum exploremus* before *quemadmodum interpretemur*: and at the end of the sentence has *exoremus* for the *exploreemus* of  $\Phi$ . This is very likely what Seneca wrote; but I think it was a correction not beyond the conjectural powers of the scholar to whom we owe elsewhere in  $\Delta$  numberless conjectures of immense ingenuity. His text, after all, told him plainly that a threefold division was required.

These two passages would, in fact, be impressive<sup>1</sup> save that the  $\Delta$  MSS. come to us with so bad a character on other grounds. There are one or two other passages—not dealt with by Gercke—where  $\Delta$  fills in plausibly a presumed lacunae—e.g. 2, 12, 6 <*nec exilire*>, 2, 18 *ictus inaequalis*, 6, 32, 9 <*feres*>. I am not able here to deal in detail either with these or with a number of variants in  $\Delta$  which certainly merit attention. It must suffice here to have dealt briefly with those passages on which Gercke himself mainly relies as indicating the independence of  $\Delta$ . I am satisfied if I can set up in a few readers of Gercke's text an active suspicion of this family of MSS. I feel, at any rate, that the whole question of their independence needs reconsidering—and by some one, let me add frankly, who has analyzed all the minutiae of the MS. data in a manner more thorough than has been possible for me. Meanwhile, if I might put dogmatically a view of the textual problem which seems to me truer than that of Gercke, I would say this.

<sup>1</sup> Mainly because the omissions in  $\Phi$  look as though they might easily be explained as due to haplography.

The  
the *Nat*  
will be t  
to cast  
himself  
tively e  
criticism  
which s  
conjectu  
to be lea  
but the s  
our natu  
in period  
seriously  
I no mor  
continue  
interpolat  
Berlin E

Let  
The  $\Phi$  cl  
and  $\rho$ .  
sented b  
thinking  
than any  
duty of t  
my own  
to be full  
accurate.  
JKLMO  
I have ne  
derived f  
slight val  
of omissio  
rather  $L^1$   
family.  
 $\Phi$  group i  
claim to  
interpolat  
and  $\lambda$  (or  
from this  
readings.

We  
principles  
cannot gu

The first duty of the next editor of Seneca will be to rid the Apparatus of the *Naturales Quaestiones* of the endless lumber of  $\Delta$  readings. His next duty will be to do what Gercke, on his own principles, ought long ago to have done to cast aside the MS, known as *Z* (and the readings of  $L^2$ , which Gercke himself rightly recognizes to have been introduced from *Z*). *Z* is a comparatively early MS. (saec. XII.), and highly interesting. But its interest for criticism is only the interest which attaches to a pre-Renaissance MS., in which some scholar of real accomplishment has occasionally restored by conjecture a true reading. *Vixere fortes ante Poggium*—that is the only lesson to be learnt from *Z*. It is rarely that this lesson is put to us so convincingly; but the study of other MSS., in other authors, is gradually helping us, against our natural prejudices, to recognize the existence of a refined Latin scholarship in periods hitherto held innocent of such a thing. I do not think that Gercke seriously dissents from this view of *Z*. But why he persists in citing this MS. I no more know than I know why, having said that  $L^2$  is derived from *Z*, he continues to cite it as though it were not. Two other MSS. so hopelessly interpolated as to be valueless are the Paris *T* and the once much vaunted Berlin *E*.

Let us see what we are now left with. We have dismissed the  $\Delta$  class. The  $\Phi$  class is split up by Gercke into three sub-classes, which he calls  $\theta$ ,  $\lambda$ , and  $\rho$ . Of these the best is undoubtedly, as Gercke holds,  $\theta$ . It is represented by *EFGH*. Of these MSS., as I have said, I agree with Gercke in thinking *H* the best MS. we have. *G* appears to be more closely allied to it than any other; but *G* has been examined only very imperfectly, and a primary duty of the next editor will be to collate this MS. in full. *F*, which belongs to my own college, Merton 250, is inferior to either *H* or *G*, but possibly deserves to be fully cited. Gercke's collation of it is endlessly defective and not always accurate. Of *E* I have already spoken. The sub-class  $\lambda$  is represented by *JKLMO* (why editors allow themselves such barbarisms in their notation as *J*, I have never understood). Of these *J* is an inferior twin of *K*, and, as perhaps derived from *K*, may be dispensed with. *M* consists merely of excerpts of slight value. *O* is marred by endless carelessnesses, particularly in the matter of omissions. The best representative of this sub-class is undoubtedly *L* (or rather  $L^1$ ). This MS. by itself is, perhaps, a sufficient representative of its family. If we need another it will have to be *K*. The third sub-class of the  $\Phi$  group is  $\rho$ . In this sub-class I can discover no independent merit. Its only claim to note is that it has preserved entire 2, 48, 1; but so has the deeply interpolated *Z*. This entirety is pretty certainly achieved by conflating  $\theta$  and  $\lambda$  (or possibly  $\Delta$  and  $\lambda$ ). Gercke adduces no examples of independence from this sub-class, and I think we might well relieve the Apparatus of its readings.

We need, then, a new Apparatus to the *Naturales Quaestiones*, in which the principles adumbrated by Gercke shall be carried—as, for reasons which I cannot guess at, Gercke does not carry them—to their logical conclusion; an

Apparatus, that is to say, in which four MSS., or at most five, shall figure, viz., *HGFL(K)*. In what follows I shall take account only of these *codices*—where I refer to any others, it will merely be for the purpose of exposing their unreliable character. In what I have said I have not, of course, attempted to prove in detail the scheme adumbrated. The proof of it is to be sought in a study of Gercke's Apparatus, and in the further information furnished by his two volumes of *Studien*.

In the criticisms and suggestions here offered I depend entirely for the report of readings upon Gercke. I have not done more myself than examine the two Merton College MSS., of one of which Gercke entertains a high opinion. (The later of the two I have only glanced at.) The numbers attached to my Notes refer to *page* and *line* in Gercke's edition. This is not an ideal method of citation, but any other would be necessarily very cumbrous, and Gercke's edition is likely to remain for some time the standard text.

2, 1-3 cum disco . . . quid sit deus, totus in se tendat an et ad nos aliquando respiciat

intendatur *Madvig*: secedat?

3, 22 sqq. o quam ridiculi sunt mortalium termini, ut ultra Istrum Dacus non exerceat imperium, Haemo Thrace se includat, Parthis obstet Euphrates

ut ante ultra *addidi* exerceat *scripsi*: exeat *codd.* Thrace se *scripsi*: Thraces *codd.*

5, 3-4

paucissimorum dierum spatium, si nauem suus ferat uentus.

For *ferat uentus* there are variants from  $\Delta$ , *uentus impleuit* and *impleat uentus*. These could perhaps be explained by an original *si sinus impleat uentus*—*nauem* being a mere gloss upon *sinus*. But, from what has been said of the character of  $\Delta$ , it seems far more likely that *impleat* is merely interpolated.

7, 27-8, 3 quemadmodum nubes collisae mediocriter fulgurationes efficiunt, maiore impetu impulsae fulmina, sic quanto illa minus pressi aeres minoresue, tanto leuiora lumina emittunt.

illa minus pressi aeres *scripsi*: illas minus presseris *codd.* lumina *scripsi*: fulmina *codd.* (*illa=ibi*; *fulmina* is clearly a blunder:—for *lumina* cf. 7, 22 *minora lumina excutiuntur*).

8, 9-10 acrior sit Caniculae rubor, Martis remissior.

*Martis* would seem to be a blunder for *Veneris*—the symbol<sup>1</sup> ♀ being mistaken for ♂. At any rate I know of no writer who attributes to Mars a *remissus color*, and he is usually represented as of a peculiarly fiery hue.

18, 24-25 nec dubium cuiquam relinquitur quin arcus solis imago sit male expressi ob uitium figuramque speculi.

For *expressi* (which is of course quite possible) we should perhaps, in view of 26, 24, *solis imago cuius exprimendae capax non est*, write *expressa*.

<sup>1</sup> At 258, 24 the symbol ☉ = *Sol* has been lost before the first letter of *obumbratur* (Skutsch).



19, 23-20, 1 nunc nihil ad rem pertinet quomodo uideamus quodcumque uidemus: sed quomodi imago similis reddi debet e speculo.

quomodi (uel quoui quoi modi) *scripsi* (= cuimodi, for cuiuscuiusmodi): quomodo *codd.*

20, 19-20 in unam imagines non coibunt, sed unaquaeque in se similitudinum *seriem* claudet.

similitudinum *seriem scripsi*: similitudinem in se rei *codd.*

21, 13-16 alioquin, ut ait Nero Caesar disertissime,

colla Cytheriacae splendent agitata columbae

et variis coloribus pauonum ceruix, quotiens aliquo deflectitur, nitet.

Gercke interprets *alioquin* by 'uebrigens.' No: *alioquin* . . . *et* means 'not only is it true that . . . but also'—the usage is illustrated in the lexicons.

22, 13-15 non enim idem facit si undique effulsit, et ad hoc opus est radiorum idoneus ictus.

Perhaps si undecumque effulsit, *set*. The variant *idonea locatio*, found in Δ, arose from *ictus* read as *locus*.

23, 9-11 purpuram Tyriam, quo melior est saturiorque, eo altius oportet teneas, ut fulgorem suum teneat.

*altius* is surely a blunder for *latius*—the cloth must be spread out, it would not be the brighter for being held *high*. *teneat* gives a wholly false sense: the *ostendat* of other MSS. might do, but Seneca probably wrote *intendat* (the *in* was easily lost after *suum*).

26, 5 sqq. in nube est aliquid uitro simile, quod potest perlucere, est aliquid et aquae quam, etsi nondum habet, iam parat, id est iam eius natura est in quam ex sua uertatur.

For *id est iam eius natura* write *id est, essentiam eius nactura*, and excise everything from *id est* . . . to *uertatur*: the words only need to be emended for it to be seen at once that they are merely a gloss on the clause preceding (*i.e. iam* was read as *i.e. iam*).

26, 24-27, 4 ita conatur quidem reddere imaginem, quia leuis est materiae et ad hoc habilis, sed non potest quia enormiter facta est. si aperta fabrica foret, totidem redderet soles quot aperuisset inspectui toros.

materiae *scripsi*: materia *codd.* aperta (=apta) fabrica *scripsi*: apta fabricata *codd.* aperuisset (=apuisset) inspectui toros *scripsi*: habuisset inspectores *codd.*

In the sentence that follows *qui quia discernuntur* etc. nothing requires altering: *qui*, which is the reading of all the good MSS., refers back to *toros*, and the *nix* which Gercke inserts after *quia* he has merely inserted because he has not perceived that *discernuntur* = *non continuantur* (not *uidentur*).

29, 24-25 quid uocem? imagines solis?

imagines? soles? *Leo*. *Malim*: solesne an imagines solis?



30, 9-11 sunt autem imagines solis in nube spissa et uicina in modum speculi.

*uicina* seems nonsensical. It is perhaps a blunder for *incurua* (i.e. *uicina* for *inc'ua*).

31, 24 debent autem hae nubes quae hoc praestant densae esse, leues, splendidae, planae, imaginaturae soles.

imaginaturae *scripsi*: naturae *codd.* (*nacturae* would perhaps be just possible). For *solis* I have written *soles* (naturae solis similes, *Leo*: if this be what Seneca wished to say a simpler correction would be <ut> *natura est* (ē) *solis*.

32, 13 sqq. horum plura genera conspiciuntur: sunt ut ei cum uelut corona cingente introrsus ingens caeli recessus est similis effossae in orbem specus: sunt pithiae cum . . . etc.

For *sunt ut ei* Gercke gives *sunt putei*. But Pliny is giving Greek names throughout. I would suggest *sunt cute* (or perhaps *ceuthe*). *pithiae* would be better written *pitheae*. In the parallel passage in Pliny, *N.H.* 2, 90, why do editors insist on retaining the false form *pitheus*, which is a mere blunder for *pitheas*?

33, 11 sqq. quia cito spatium sursum transilit et oculis nostris occurrit uniuersum per quod deiectus est.

sursum *uel* suum *uel* sursum suum *codd.* Perhaps *s(e)orsum*.

40, 17 sqq. tunc quoque cum antiqui illi uiri incondite uiuerent, satis nitidi si squalorem opere collectum aduerso flumine eluerant, cura comere capillum fuit ac prominentem barbam depectere, et in hac re sibi quisque alteri in uicem operam dabat.

Between *eluerant* and *cura* Gercke wishes to insert (and, indeed, has inserted) the word *parua*. Nothing could be more false, since, from *tunc quoque*, it is clear that Seneca would then be implying that in his time also the 'cura' for these adornments was 'parua'—which is precisely the opposite of what he is trying to say.

Some deep corruption lurks in the end of the sentence. I would suggest that *alteri* has taken the place of the genitive of some noun meaning 'hair-dresser.' *cinerarii*, which would give the required sense, is too far from the *ductus litterarum*. Can the right word be *comatori(i)*: (? *atori* = *alteri*)? Petronius has *acu comatoria* (21), of a hairpin, and (*seruus*) *comatorius* seems just possible in the sense of *cinerarius*.

41, 11-13 o felix paupertas quae tanto titulo locum fecit, non fecisset illa dotem si habuissent.

So the best MSS. (I have put a comma after *fecit*). Both Madvig and *Leo* have suggested violent changes. I see no reason for any change at all, and would render: 'O blessed Poverty that made such glory possible but would

not have left room for it if they (the daughters of Scipio) had had a dowry to begin with (if their family had possessed wealth).<sup>i</sup> *illa* refers back to *paupertas*, which is practically personified. Poverty was the cause of this great distinction, but she would not have been the cause of it if the daughters of Scipio had not been too poor to receive the ordinary marriage portion. There is a slight illogicality, but it is that of an epigram missing fire.

45, 7-10 *rursus quasi pars est sanguis nostri, et tamen est materia: prae-  
parat enim idem alimentum et nihilominus in numero eorum est quibus totum  
corpus efficitur.*

*alimentum scripsi: alia codd.* (*ali* was taken for *alia*). I have further written *idem* for the *id* or *et* of the MSS., and have accepted the *et tamen* of several of the interpolated MSS. as against the *qui et tamen* of the others. The

*i*  
contraction *ali* for *alimentum* is given as fourteenth century in Cappelli, but the MSS. of Seneca bear witness to an archetype which contained many contractions which lack attestation (so far as our knowledge goes) from early MSS. The subject is one on which we are still very insufficiently informed. At N.Q. p. 136, 26 *generabitur* is accepted as a certain correction of the MSS. *glorabitur*. But this implies a confusion of *glabitur* and *gnabitur*—both of which contractions, therefore, must be of considerable antiquity. The date and character, I may say in passing, of the Archetype of our MSS. has not been adequately investigated. A proper investigation would yield, I fancy, some notable problems. The Archetype was clearly in a minuscule hand: a hand, incidentally, in which *autem* and *enim* easily lent themselves to confusion (see e.g. 20, 1: 61, 3: 146, 8; but Lindsay has recently pointed out, *Revue des Bibliothèques*, 1912, that we must be cautious what inference we draw from this confusion in MSS.). But the remarkable thing about the MSS. of Seneca is the thoroughgoing and repeated recensions to which the different groups have been subjected since their separation from the common minuscule stock. (The Archetype is scarcely older than saec. ix.)

45, 26-46, 6 *pars quare sit non puto te interrogaturum, ut neque interrogas quare caelum pars sit: quia scilicet non magis sine hoc quam sine illa uniuersum potest esse; quod cum in his universi summa est ex quibus usquam alitur, ex hac alimenta omnibus animalibus, omnibus satis, omnibus stellis diuiduntur . . .*

in *ante* his *addidi*: *uniuersi summa scripsi: uniuersis codd.* (*uniuersum dett.*)

*a*  
(*uniuersis* is a misunderstanding of *uniuersi s. = uniuersi summa*) *quibus usquam scripsi: quibus quam codd.* *alitur addidi* ('the sum of the universe consists in the materials everywhere of its nourishment').

These proposed changes are not, I think, more drastic than those of most editors—of whom Gercke is the least satisfactory. Why Gercke should refuse

to accept Kroll's certain correction *ut neque* (*aeque* codd.) *interrogas* I am not able to divine.

47, 9-10 *nonne intenti spiritus opera sunt?*

Perhaps *opera fiunt* (*opera* abl. sing.).

47, 17 *nonne aeris intentione partes suas explicant?*

Gercke's comment I find unintelligible. *explicant* appears to be put for *explant* (unless *explant* be the true reading).

51, 16 *hae tot partes.*

The best MSS. have *haec*. Why Gercke prefers *hae* I cannot surmise, *haec*, as the rarer form, is clearly preferable, and the *c* might easily have been lost before *tot*.

52, 2-3 *nec tamen eodem modo totus afficitur sed aliter alibi et partibus inquietus ac turbidus est.*

The text can hardly be sound. Perhaps for *et partibus* we should read *nec paribus* <*uicibus*>.

52, 9-12 *sed ceterae quoque stellae non minus terrena quam incumbentem terris spiritum afficiunt et circuitu suo occursuue contrario modo frigora modo imbres aliasque terris turbide iniurias mouent.*

*circuitu scripsi*: *cultu* (*uel ortu dett.*) codd.

54, 20-21 *ita non descendit ignis sed praecipitatur et deducitur.*

*decutitur* or *deicitur* seems more likely than *deducitur*.

60, 15-17 *nec hoc tantum in his debere credi ac siderum quorum ingens in confesso potentia est.*

For *ac siderum* read *consideramus* (= *csideram*). This is as near as Madvig's suggestion, and does not, as does his, necessitate our receiving the *debet* of the inferior MSS. (I find it difficult, moreover, to believe that *accidere* (Madvig) could easily have passed into *ac siderum*).

61, 13 *quomodo, inquit, cum dicatis ignis hanc esse naturam ut petat superiora, fulmen terram petit? aut falsum est hoc aut falsum est quod de igne dixistis.*

The words italicized are my own supplement.

62, 10-12 *quomodo ergo possunt gignere ignem, quem non ueri simile est ex nube quam ex aqua nascitur?*

*ET* have *fieri* for *nascitur*. This is, no doubt, the merest interpolation. But it seems to point to *nasci* as the true correction. Yet Gercke has actually printed in the text his own conjecture *nasciturum*! Adeo grammatici nostri ea quae quibus puer Romanus sciebat neglegunt, nos autem senes ea operose quaerere cogimur quae magistri nostri olim tradere debebant! (Lachmann,

*Lucr.* p. 207), *nascitur* arose from *ex urbe nascitur* following (which, no doubt, itself needs explanation).

63, 5 sqq. quidni? maiorum nostrorum memoria, ut Poseidonius tradidit, cum insula in Aegaeo mari surgeret, spumabat interdiu mare et fumus ex alto ferebatur: nam demum (deinde *JKLMO*) prodebat ignem, non continuum sed ex interuallis emicantem fulminum more . . . etc.

Madvig altered *nam* to *nox*, with the approval of Gercke and the world—a correction palaeographically singularly improbable. I suspect that for *interdiu* we should read *interdum* ('for a time'), and then, for *nam*, *una* (with *deinde*). For a while there was just smoke, then smoke accompanied by (*una*) flame. (Presently there was a discharge of rocks and stones).

72, 10 sqq. per mitte mihi illam rigidam sectam tueri eorum qui excipiunt ista et nihil esse aliud quam aegrae mentis solatia existimant.

The corruption perhaps goes deeper than the various remedies proposed suggest. Possibly *qui extispicum ista nihil* is not more remote than most of the emendations recorded by Gercke.

74, 8-13 ista nobis opponi solent ut probetur nihil uoluntati nostrae relictum et omne ius fati faciendi traditum.

A much-vexed passage where none of the proposed corrections satisfy. I would hazard *relictum, et non nisi ius fati patiendi traditum*.

76, 3 sqq. omnia ista urunt sed genere et modo differunt: quodcumque combustum est utique et ustum est, at quod ustum est non utique combustum est: item quod accensum est (potest *autem* illud ipso transitu ignis ussisse) quis nescit uri quidem nec ardere, nihil autem ardere quod non et uratur?

Save *autem* for *enim* (see on 45, 7-10) I have altered nothing but the punctuation—following here a suggestion of Gercke. I see nothing the matter either with the sense or with the Latinity. Seneca is distinguishing *uro* = burn, *comburo* = burn up, *accendo* = fire, *afflare* = scorch, *ardere* = blaze.

76, 17 sqq. haec adhuc Etruscis philosophisque communia sunt: in illo dissentiant quod fulmina a Ioue (fulmina nouem, the best MSS.) dicunt mitti et tres illi manubias dant.

So Gercke's text (a Ioue ΔE). But compare Pliny, *N.H.* 2, 138: Tuscorum litterae nouem deos emittere fulmina existimant, eaque esse undecim generum: Iouem enim tria iaculari. This passage would seem to guarantee nouem to Seneca: in that case we shall have to correct *illi* (which Δ omits) to *Ioui*.

H. W. GARROD.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.

[To be continued.]

## CLAVDIVS AND THE PRIMORES GALLIAE:

### A REPLY AND A RESTATEMENT.

IN the April number of the *Classical Quarterly*, Mr. H. J. Cunningham calls in question my interpretation of a passage in the speech of Claudius on the claims of the Gallic chieftains, which I will follow his good example by quoting in full. It forms the first legible sentence of Column II.

'Sane nouo m[ore] et diuus Aug[ustus au]unc[ulus m]e[us] et patruus Ti. Cæsar omnem florem ubique coloniarum et municipiorum, bonorum scilicet hominum et locupletium, in hac curia esse uoluit. Quid ergo? Non Italicus senator prouinciali potior est? Iam uobis, cum hanc partem censurae meae adprobare coepero, quid de ea re sentiam, rebus ostendam. Sed ne prouinciales quidem, si modo ornare curiam poterunt, reiciendos puto.'

That this statement represents not only the practice, but the deliberate policy (*uoluit*) probably of Augustus, certainly of Tiberius, as to the admission of senators from outside Rome, will, I imagine, be admitted by all. The only question is whether any geographical limitation is to be placed upon the phrase 'coloniae et municipia,' or in other words, whether a 'municipalis origo' generally, joined, of course, to respectability and wealth, was by these emperors made the condition of eligibility to the senate, or whether, in spite of the generality of the phrase, and the addition of the word 'ubique,' we are justified in limiting this eligibility to a particular portion of the empire.

In consideration of the fact that there were a large number of colonies and *municipia* in provinces like Narbonensis, Baetica, Tarraconensis and Africa, and that 'ubique' could not have been inserted without some reason, I have, as Mr. Cunningham complains, given to the latter word its full force, and translated it 'throughout the empire.' As the logical result of this interpretation, I have assumed that, under the conditions of eligibility thus laid down by the first two emperors, Roman citizens belonging to the provinces named above might be, and were, admitted to the senate, but that the Gallic chieftains, about whose want of a 'municipalis origo' there can be no doubt, would be excluded.

I was, of course, aware that Mr. Furneaux had given a different and a narrower meaning to the phrase 'coloniae et municipia,' taking it as equivalent to 'the towns of Italy,' an interpretation which would limit 'ubique' to mean 'throughout Italy.' In his note to *Ann.* III. 55, he infers from this passage of the Speech of Claudius that Tiberius admitted many senators from Italian towns, and refers back to his note on I. 79, 10. On the latter passage he says that 'these terms (*coloniae et municipia*) are constantly used together by Tacitus (*cf.* III. 55, 4; IV. 67, 1; XV. 33, 3; *Hist.* II. 20, 1; 56, 1; 62, 4; etc.) to designate the towns of Italy.' If Mr. Furneaux had expressed any strong view as to the policy of either Tiberius or Claudius in this matter, I certainly should not have ignored it, but, as these notes seemed more or less incidental, and I thought his references far from convincing, I did not notice his suggestion. Since, however, Mr. Cunningham has restated Furneaux's interpretation of



the phrase 'coloniae et municipia,' adding to the references cited above some not altogether happily selected ones of his own, and claims by their means to show that 'the one piece of evidence which I can produce in support of my explanation gives it no support whatever,' I propose to examine the imposing array of passages which are adduced to establish this statement.

Mr. Cunningham hardly does justice to my position when he says that I 'apparently think that the colonies and *municipia* alluded to are those in the provinces.' On the contrary, my whole argument, as well as my translation of 'ubique' implies that they are the towns of that description both in Italy and in the provinces. I do not, of course, deny that the great majority of the 'noui homines' spoken of in *Ann.*, III. 55, came from Italian towns. Mr. Cunningham simplifies the issue by asserting not only that the phrase 'coloniae et municipia' is constantly used of Italian towns, which in its distributive sense nobody will deny, but that it 'so comes to be an equivalent for Italy.' To prove this last point, on which his whole argument depends, he prefixes to Furneaux's references the following: *Lex agr.* 31; *Sall. Cat.* 17 and 58; *De bell. Gall.*, VIII., 50; and *Mon. Anc.* 21.

As all these passages are cited with the sole object of proving that the phrase in question is 'equivalent to Italy,' it is curious that Mr. Cunningham should think it relevant to remark that 'in most of these passages' (he might have said 'in all') 'the context shows that Italian towns are meant.' The whole question involved in this passage of the speech is whether the words 'coloniae et municipia' are to decide the meaning of 'ubique,' or whether that word is to decide the extension of the phrase. As there were notoriously a large number of colonies and *municipia* outside Italy, it would seem natural to let the context in each case (and here it is the word 'ubique') decide the range of the expression. If this is objected to, it can only be on the ground that 'coloniae et municipia' was not only a description of Italian towns, as indicated by the context, but such a recognized synonym for 'Italy,' and so independent of any context, as actually to limit, as in the present case, the usual wide meaning of a word like 'ubique.' Considering the point he has to prove, Mr. Cunningham would have been wiser to keep out of sight, what an examination of his references will soon enough reveal, that it is in every case the context and not the phrase itself which fixes the reference to Italy.

But what is even more surprising after all this marshalling of evidence to prove the equivalence of the phrase to 'Italy,' is the fact that in only two passages out of twelve is it used collectively at all, and that in the other ten, so far from being equivalent to Italy, it is merely applied to certain Italian towns strictly limited by the context as to number or locality or both.

I will not apologise for taking Mr. Cunningham's references one by one. He presumably depends upon their cumulative weight, and he shall have the full benefit of it.

1. *Lex Agr.* 31. Mention is made here of certain 'coloniae seive mounicipia ciuium Rom. nominisue Latini' to which public land 'fruentus datus est.' They are, of course, Italian towns, because this part of the law is dealing only with land in Italy, and because in 111 B.C. there were, with a solitary exception or two, no colonies or *municipia* outside Italy. As the expression is not only not used collectively of all towns within this class, but excludes all *civitates foederatae*, i.e., the great majority of Italian towns, it seems preposterous to cite the phrase here as 'equivalent to Italy.'

2. *Sall. Cat.* 17. After naming Catiline's associates among the senators and equites, Sallust adds: 'ad hoc multi ex coloniis et municipiis domi nobiles.' There were still no such towns outside Italy, and again the phrase is not used collectively. It is not equivalent to 'Italy,' but to 'some of the towns in Italy.' The collective

description of Italian towns at this time would have been 'coloniae municipia et praefecturae.'

3. *Id. ib.* 58. Catiline, addressing his army, points out that their case is desperate unless they gain a victory. But if they do, 'omnia nobis tuta erunt, commeatus abunde, municipia atque coloniae patebunt.' He does not mean that 'Italy' would be won by a single victory, but that the neighbouring towns and those along the road to Rome would open their gates and furnish supplies.

4. *Hirtius, De bell. Gall.* VIII., 50. Caesar, after spending the winter in Gaul, hastens into Italy, in order to recommend Antony's candidature for an augurship to the 'municipia et coloniae.' The passage is quite irrelevant to Mr. Cunningham's point. Caesar's objective was 'Italy,' because he had business with some of the Italian towns, obviously those in the proximity of his own province.

5. *Tac. Ann.* I. 79. The question was raised in the senate as to preventing Tiber floods by diverting some of its tributaries and by damming some of the lakes which fed its waters. Many towns besides the three named by Tacitus, might be injuriously affected by these operations, and accordingly 'audita municipiorum et coloniarum legationes.' The towns were obviously all within the area directly or indirectly affected by the suggested works. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Cunningham had looked this reference up before including it among passages supposed to prove that 'coloniae et municipia,' is a phrase 'equivalent to Italy.'

6. *Id. ib.* iv., 67. Tiberius, passing through Campania, though he had notified the people of the towns not to disturb his privacy, 'perosus tamen municipia et colonias omniaque in continenti sita, Capreas in insulam se abdidit.' The towns are so obviously those in Campania along the emperor's route, that we need waste no more time over this irrelevant passage.

7. *Id. ib.* xv., 33. Nero, wishing for a wider audience, chooses Naples as the scene of his first public performance. Accordingly, the theatre at Naples is filled with 'contractum oppidanorum uulgus, et quos e proximis municipiis et coloniis eius rei fama acciuerat.' Again I am compelled to ask, had Mr. Cunningham verified this reference, which alludes only to the colonies and *municipia* in the immediate proximity of Naples?

8. *Id. Hist.* II. 20. Caecina, leaving his cruelty and licence on the other side of the Alps, 'modesto agmine per Italiam incescit. Ornatum ipsius municipia et coloniae in superbiam trahebant.' The local limitation of the phrase is not less evident here than in the previous passages. The words 'per Italiam' are in contrast with 'post Alpes,' and merely mark the fact that the towns in question are south of the Alps.

9. *Id. ib.* II. 56. 'Ceterum Italia grauius et atrocius quam bello afflictabatur. Dispersi per municipia et colonias Vitelliani spoliare rapere.' I suppose it might be argued here that 'municipia et coloniae' is a mere repetition of 'Italia.' I do not think so. Italy, as in the last passage, is used in strong contrast with the provinces. Unlike them, Italian soil was supposed to be free from war and its concomitants, and the violation of this theory is marked by the first sentence. The second gives particular instances. The towns, *i.e.*, those which lay along their line of march, were brutally treated by the soldiers. Possibly more towns are included under the phrase than in the other passages, but it is no more used collectively than in them.

10. *Id. ib.* II. 62. Among other acts of moderation and reform, Vitellius forbade Roman knights to disgrace themselves in the arena. Previous emperors had often enforced this, 'ac pleraque municipia et coloniae aemulabantur corruptissimum quemque . . . pretio inicere.' The qualifying 'pleraque' is of course fatal to the phrase being taken in a collective sense. It means not 'Italy,' but 'a good many Italian towns.'

In the light of this examination, it is, I think, not too much to say that these ten passages are utterly irrelevant to the point which they are cited to establish. I have reserved to the last two passages in which the phrase 'municipia et coloniae' is undoubtedly used collectively, and is applicable to all or any Italian towns. I suspect that they will not do much to help Mr. Cunningham's cause.

11. Mon. Anc. IV. 21. In this passage Augustus makes a statement which is equivalent to saying that he remitted the *aurum coronarium* to the whole of Italy, and he uses the words 'municipiis et coloniis.' But those who have followed Mr. Cunningham's argument will be surprised to find that he does not use them alone, and that the actual statement is 'Italiae municipiis et coloniis . . . remisi.' Does Mr. Cunningham really think that this is an instance which he has a right to cite of 'municipia et coloniae' being 'equivalent to Italy?' If he does, he is following some canon of logic unknown to me.

12. Tac. Ann. III. 55. 'Noui homines e municipiis et coloniis ac etiam prouinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti.' This is the only passage which Mr. Cunningham quotes, and I wish that I had remembered it when I was dealing with the subject. It occurs among some general reflections on the period between Actium and the accession of Galba, but I believe that it refers to the time of Augustus or Tiberius, though it was no doubt true under Claudius, if not under Nero. It is undoubtedly a statement that senators were adlected from Italy and the provinces. But it is essential to remember that this is not one instance among many others of the phrase 'coloniae et municipia' standing for 'Italy,' for every one of the supposed instances has broken down. I claim, therefore, that the phrase with an open context means, what it ought to mean, all towns constituted on the Italian model. That the policy with regard to admission to the senate, certainly of Tiberius, probably of Augustus, was in some way formulated, is clear from the words of Claudius, quoted above, and also that it turned on the phrase 'coloniae et municipia.' I understand that it conditioned eligibility by an *origo* in one of these communities. The word 'ubique' was not necessary, and was probably not contained in the rule as laid down by Augustus or Tiberius, but was not unnaturally inserted by Claudius, who wished to emphasise the already established eligibility of provincials. Tacitus was presumably aware of the rule as formulated by the earlier emperors, and knew that technically it could be described by saying 'Noui homines e municipiis et coloniis in senatum adsumpti.' But as his readers were not likely to be always thinking in terms of constitutional law, he added, to make an important point explicit, 'ac etiam prouinciis,' which is really no more than the 'ubique' of Claudius. Mr. Cunningham comes to the passage with the preconceived opinion that 'municipia et coloniae' mean 'Italy,' and accordingly finds in the phrase a sharp contrast to 'prouinciae,' which by a curious *non sequitur* he thinks is made practically certain by the words of Suetonius (*Vesp.* IX), 'honestissimo quoque Italicorum et prouincialium adlecto.' Mr. Cunningham's first argument has depended on an appeal to unquoted and irrelevant references, and a misinterpretation on the strength of their supposed cumulative weight of the one relevant and important passage.

His second objection to my view will be found to rest upon a still more serious misunderstanding of the argument and order of thought in this part of Claudius' speech. He thinks, as apparently did Mr. Furneaux, that the introduction of the 'senator Italicus' into the next sentence confirms the restricted application of 'coloniae et municipia.' Claudius is here, according to Mr. Cunningham, dealing with an anticipated objection, which 'freely paraphrased,' amounts to this: 'But these were Italians, whereas you are proposing to bring in provincials, a very different thing.' But this way of putting things inevitably suggests that what Claudius proposed in 46 A.D., what the senators objected to, and what was 'a very different

thing' from anything done by Augustus or Tiberius, was the admission of provincials to the senate. In that case, to what period does Mr. Cunningham assign the statement in *Ann.* III. 55 that new men were admitted to the senate from the provinces? When were the senators of Narbonensis admitted, to whom in 49 A.D. Claudius gave the right of visiting their estates at will? (*Ann.* XII. 23) How does he explain Claudius' own statement about Vienna, that it had sent senators to Rome 'longo iam tempore'? or the fact that Valerius Asiaticus was a consular under Caligula? or the presence of the worthy senators from Lugudunum? It is abundantly clear that provincials had been admitted in some numbers by Tiberius and perhaps by Augustus, and this fact is entirely irreconcilable with Mr. Cunningham's explanation of the objection which Claudius is answering.

Besides, how can there have been any objection to Claudius' proposal at this point of the speech, when the most superficial reading of it shows that no proposal had yet been made at all? It is not until after he has dealt with Vienna and Vestinus and Asiaticus, that the emperor reminds himself that it is time 'detegere patribus conscriptis quo tendat oratio tua.' Even then, the actual proposal is postponed for half a dozen lines, and, when it comes at last, it is not a proposal to admit provincials in contrast with Italians, but to admit senators from a particular region, Gallia Comata, lying outside 'adsuetos familiaresque uobis prouinciarum terminos,' from which senators had hitherto been taken. Then, having made his proposal, but naturally not before, Claudius proceeds to deal with anticipated objections to it. It would have been well if Mr. Cunningham had revived his memory of the speech before presenting such a travesty of its argument as that involved in his interpretation. He asks why Italy and Italian senators should 'be dragged into a discussion which only concerns two classes of residents in the provinces.' They are of course dragged into no such discussion for the simple reason that Claudius has not yet reached the point at which these two classes of provincials are distinguished.

That there is a sufficient reason on my interpretation for the introduction of the Italian senator will, I think, be obvious if I too may be allowed the liberty of a 'free paraphrase.' I will venture to put the whole passage in this way:

'It was an innovation for Augustus and Tiberius to lay it down that the senate-house should be open to men of property and respectability from any colonies or *municipia* throughout the Empire' (cries of disapproval from benches on the right). 'Ah! you think that policy puts Italians and provincials too much on the same footing, and that Italians make the better senators. Well, when I come to my actual adlection, you will see that to some extent I share that feeling, but not the prejudice which would exclude provincials altogether. But to return to my predecessors' policy, look, for instance, at the colony of Vienna, etc.'

As a matter of fact, there are two points about the passage which on Mr. Cunningham's view of it are absolutely inexplicable. (1) How can the policy of Augustus and Tiberius be described as 'nouo more,' if it merely opened the senate to the towns of Italy? No one, I imagine, will deny that in Cicero's time a considerable number of senators were, like himself, new men from the Italian towns. Tacitus, indeed, makes Claudius himself speak of men, 'Etruria Lucaniaque et omni Italia in senatum accitos,' at a date before Italy was extended to the Alps (*Ann.* XI. 24). (2) Why in the very next sentence of the set speech—for Mr. Cunningham himself admits that 'quid ergo . . . puto' is a digression answering an objection—immediately following upon the phrase 'coloniae et municipia,' does Claudius take as an instance the colony of Vienna? Surely the only reason can be that it fell under the colonies just alluded to.

Mr. Cunningham concludes with exhorting any with whom my theory may have

found a  
of Pro  
mine u  
relinqu  
chiefs o  
the ins  
With b  
that all  
ineligib  
might p  
quaesto  
compet  
agree th  
had alr  
these ch

It  
venture  
When l  
. . . the  
the disa  
stripe, a  
strikes o  
in Profe  
Gauls, a  
chiefs w  
provinci  
to this v  
was clea  
and eve  
Asiaticu

But  
and Tibe  
these ch  
attitude  
sure to  
grounds,  
policy of  
would h  
believe t  
the situa  
such from  
by reason  
those wh  
and essen  
with its  
organisat  
us, is it  
responsib  
to be a  
Mr. Cunn  
diplomati  
Augustus



found acceptance, to return to the view of Professor Pelham. Fortunately the value of Professor Pelham's view does not depend on the success of his supporter to prove mine untenable. Nor is there any occasion to return to what no one need have relinquished. Professor Pelham showed that the citizenship granted to the Gallic chiefs could not have been anything analogous to the old *ciuitas sine suffragio*, and that the *ius honorum* could not have been separated from the other rights of the *ciuitas*. With both these points I am in entire agreement. I also agree with his contention that all provincials and almost all Italians were on exactly the same footing as being ineligible for the senate, unless the emperor did for them one of two things. He might give them the *latus clauus* with which they could become candidates for the quaestorship, and so, if elected, pass into the senate; or, he might by his censorial competence adlect them at once into the senate 'inter quaestorios.' We further agree that by one or other of these methods provincials from Narbonensis and Spain had already got into the senate, but that so far no emperor had come to the relief of these chieftains from Gallia Comata or their ancestors.

It is in the explanation why the Gallic chiefs were treated differently that I venture to think Professor Pelham's statement ambiguous and in need of supplement. When he says 'the real obstacle in the path of these noble Gauls was the fact that . . . they had not the broad senatorial stripe,' it is obvious that he is merely stating the disability and not explaining it, for why did not the emperors give the broad stripe, as they did to other provincials? But though the sentence I have quoted strikes one as insufficient, I think, from reading his paper again, that the real obstacle in Professor Pelham's opinion was the deep seated Roman prejudice against these Gauls, and the fact that, through their wealth and the number of their retainers, the chiefs were more powerful and possibly more dangerous personages than the ordinary provincial aspirant to the senate. Like Mr. Cunningham, I 'see no serious objection to this view,' though I would note that the prejudice, if stronger against the Gauls, was clearly felt against all provincial candidates, and that the possession of wealth and even of retainers (*gentiles*) had not prevented the advancement of Valerius Asiaticus.

But even if we assume, as I think we may, with Professor Pelham, that Augustus and Tiberius identified themselves with this prejudice, and regarded the admission of these chiefs to senatorial dignity as an experiment too hazardous to be tried, what attitude were they to take up towards the chiefs themselves, some of whom would be sure to ask for what other provincials received? To put a refusal on the real grounds, if these were the real grounds, would have been too inconsistent with the policy of conciliation towards Gaul, of which Augustus gave so many proofs, and would have turned these powerful chiefs into open malcontents. This is where I believe that my theory may usefully supplement Professor Pelham's explanation of the situation. How was the new imperial principle of not excluding provincials as such from an official or senatorial career to be reconciled with the necessity, dictated by reasons of state, for at least marking time in the case of Gallia Comata? Even those who do not accept my hypothesis will not deny that there was a very marked and essential difference between the administrative organisation of the Tres Galliae with its practical absence of colonies and *municipia* and the thoroughly urban organisation of Italy, Spain, and Narbonensis. But if this distinction is so patent to us, is it too far-fetched to suppose that Augustus, who more than anyone else was responsible for it, should have used it as a solution for what can hardly have failed to be a delicate question? To me, at any rate, the principle, as set forth, *pace* Mr. Cunningham, by Claudius, appears in the light of a solution not unworthy of the diplomatic finesse, which from first to last was the most conspicuous characteristic of Augustus. There was not a word about exclusion or disqualification; it was a broad



and generous manifesto of inclusion. More than this; it was obviously and logically the next step forward in advance of the course taken in this matter under the late Republic, when senators had been freely admitted from the municipalities of Italy. Suitable men were now to be eligible from colonies and *municipia*, wherever they were found. There was no indication therefore of any intention to bar the way against anyone. But when from time to time Gallic chiefs demanded what Augustus was not prepared to give, it was possible to point out with tact and politeness that their *civitates*, having been expressly organised in such a way as not to stifle national life or national aspirations, did not exactly fit in with the municipal system usually adopted, and on which unfortunately admission to a career in Rome had been made to depend. This may not always have satisfied ambitious chiefs, but at least they were made to feel that it was the imperial system which blocked their way, and not considerations which would have wounded their individual and national susceptibilities. It was very easy, too, as Claudius proved, in spite of senatorial prejudice, to remove the obstacle whenever it seemed advisable, and it can hardly be doubted that the first step taken in 46 A.D. towards its removal was wise and statesmanlike.

E. G. HARDY.

*Jesus College, Oxford.*

#### THE PAEAN OF PHILODAMOS OF SCARPHEIA.

LINES 53 to 56 stand thus in Weil, *Bulletin de Corr. Hell.* xix. 393 sqq., and Weir Smyth's *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 525:

["E]ν[θεν ἐ]π' ὀλβίας χθονὸς	53
Θελ[ξινόας] ἔκελσας, ᾗ	
Στῆσε μένος τ(ε) 'Ολυμπί[ας]	55
['Εξορ]ίαν τε κλειτάν.	

Weil supposes this to mean 'the land which ended the anger of the Olympian goddess, and Dionysos' famous exile': (the context speaks of his wanderings); and the goddess he takes to be Hera. But in l. 55 the stone has ΣΤΗΤΕ, and στῆσε is Weil's correction of what he supposes to be an error: the letters in brackets are also his restoration. All this is far-fetched, and dependent on this alteration in the text: ἐξορία also is a late and rare word. The stone has preserved the reading correctly

ΕΚΕΛΣΑΣ | ΣΤΗΤΕΜΕΝΟΣΤΕ,

that is, ἔκελσας ᾗστη τέμενός τε, which Weil has divided wrongly. We may then restore the lines thus:

"E]ν[θεν ἐ]π' ὀλβίας χθονὸς	53
Θεσ[σαλίας] ἔκελσας ᾗ-	
στη, τέμενός τ' 'Ολύμπι[ον],	55
[Πιερ]ίαν τε κλειτάν.	

Θεσσαλίας, 'Ολύμπιον and Πιερίαν suit the context. There appears to be some uncertainty how the third letter in l. 54 should be read: Weil, p. 405. Τέμενος 'Ολύμπιον I take to mean 'the sacred region of Olympus.' For Dionysos and Pieria cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 565, μάκαρ ᾧ Πιερία, σέβεται σ' Εὐνός.

J. U. POWELL.

*St. John's College, Oxford.*

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** Vol. 35. No. 2. 1914.

G. M. Bolling, *The Archetype of Our Iliad and the Papyri*. It is probable that all the MSS. of Homer come from a single archetype, though Caer's argument from Γ 453 (based on the necessity of accepting the correction *ἐκείνων δὲ*) cannot be sustained. The study of the vulgate papyri shows that (when allowance has been made for their accidental omissions) a number of lines have been inserted in the *Iliad* since 150 B.C. About one-fifth of these lines omitted by the papyri introduce speeches after a verb of speaking has already been employed. All the rest can be omitted without detriment, and are omitted in many MSS., and none can be proved to have been in Aristarchus's text. Lines only *athetized* by him do appear in the papyri. E. W. Fay, *Varroniana de Lingua Latina. Part I*. A sheaf of notes critical, syntactical and etymological on book V. of Varro's treatise. R. B. Steele, *The Participle in Livy*. A miscellany of details of usage and statistics relating mainly to the past and present participles.

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.** 1914.

June 6. Adolf Clausen, *Kritik und Exegese der homerischen Gleichnisse im Altertum* (Eberhard). H. Mutschmann, *Tendenz, Aufbau und Quellen der Schrift vom Erhabenen* (Ammon). O. Hartlich, *De Galeni 'Υγιεινῶν libro quinto* (Kind). H. Magnus, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, rec. app. crit. instr. H. M. (Ehwald). Very highly praised.

June 13. O. Kramer, *C. Valeri Flacci Argonauticon libri VIII*, ed. O. K. (Helm). The reviewer discusses the Praefatio at some length. W. Strehl and W. Soltau, *Grundriss der alten Geschichte und Quellenkunde*. 2. verm. u. verb. Aufl. Bd. I (Lenschau). A good guide to controversial questions and the literature about them (down to about the middle of 1913).

June 20. E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum. Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des römischen Reiches. I. Band: Die Staatsverträge und Vertragsverhältnisse* (Soltau). Very highly praised. A. Merlin, *Forum et églises de Sufetula*. Notes et Documents publiés par la Direction des Antiquités et Arts. Mit 5 Tafeln und 11 Abbildg. im Text (Oehler). Shows the results of the work done by the French from 1906 to 1911.

June 27. O. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften* (Wissowa). Contains 74 papers, 15 of which were read to the Berlin Academy, but have not been printed before. Most of these latter deal with the Republican period, some with the early Empire. R. Delbrück, *Hellenistische Bauten in Latium*. Bd. II. Baubeschreibungen und geschichtliche Erläuterung (Köster). An expensive book (58 M.) with 22 Tafeln, 119 Textabb.; it shows how Roman building developed in the last two centuries B.C. under Greek and Oriental influences.

July 4. K. B. Bitterauf, *Der Schlussteil der Aristotelischen Biologie*. Beiträge zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik der Schrift 'de generatione animalium' (Stadler). L. Dalmasso, (1) *La formazione delle parole in Palladio*; (2) *Il vocabolario tecnico*

*di un tardo scrittore georgico.* Contributo alla semasiologia palladiana (Schmalz). W. Riezler, *Weissgründige attische Lekythen.* Nach A. Furtwänglers Auswahl. Textband: XI, 143 S. 56 Abb. Tafelband: 98 Tafeln. 300 M. (Pagenstecher). V. Macchioro, *Le Terme romane di Agnano* (Behn). K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik.* Vierte verm. Aufl. bearb. von A. Thumb (Meltzer). Recommended to all teachers of Greek, not only to the specialist in the history of language.

July 11. J. T. Allardice and E. A. Junks, *An Index of the Adverbs of Plautus* (Schmalz). It is a pity that only the Oxford text has been used. W. M. Lindsay, *S. Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome.* Thewrewkianis copiis usus ed. W. M. L. (Goetz). Praised. F. Dölger, *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit.* Gesammelte Studien (Bauer). Nineteen papers by various writers. E. Buschor, *Griechische Vasenmalerei* (Behn). Very highly praised.

July 18. E. Sittig, *De Graecorum nominibus theophris* (K. F. W. Schmidt). Important for the study of Greek religion. Seeks to trace by such names as Διογέτρων the original site and the extent of the worship of various gods. The author thinks that Athena came to Athens relatively late from Boeotia; the reviewer says that the name of the goddess and of the town date, like the names of the rivers and mountains of Attica, from a time before the coming of the Greeks. E. Babelon, *Moneta* (Küthmann). Discusses the origin of the word and the development of its meaning. J. Wackernagel, *Über die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Meltzer). The reviewer gives a summary of this interesting 'Festrede.'

July 25. R. von Pöhlmann, *Die Weltanschauung des Tacitus* (Bardt). Second edition, considerably enlarged. T. Sauciuc, *Andros.* Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Topographie der Insel (H. v. Gaertringen). Valuable.

#### Classical Philology. Vol. 8. No. 3. 1913.

R. C. Flickinger, *Tragedy and the Satyric Drama.* Defends the 'goat-song' etymology and rejects the 'goat-men' speculations. A. Shewan, *The 'Continuation' of the Odyssey.* Detailed defence of the genuineness of *Od.* 23. 296 to end so far as relates to A 'Language and Verse.' E. W. Fay, *Catullus carmen 2.* In favour of the tradition on the whole. E. B. Clapp, *The Pindaric Poems of Theocritus.* On Theocr. xvi, xvii. R. G. Kent, *The Vedic Path of the Gods and the Roman Pontifex.* The pontifex made or kept in order the *pontes* ('paths') between the worlds of the living and that of the gods and the dead. J. P. Postgate, *Propertiana.* On five passages of books III and IV. E. H. Sturtevant, *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation.* On nouns in -ψ. J. A. J. Drewitt, *A Note on the Augment.* Max Radin, *The Wife of Gaius Gracchus and her Dowry.* P. Shorey, *On Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics vii. 7.* 1149b, 31 sqq.

#### Vol. 8. No. 4. 1913.

E. T. Merrill on *Cic. Fam. xv. 20, Verg. (?) Catal. 10 and Ventidius.* There is no allusion to Ventidius. F. E. Robbins, *The Creation Story in Ovid Met. i.* His account is essentially Stoic. Lynn Thorndike, *A Roman Astrologer as a Historical Source.* On Julius Firmicus Maternus. C. C. Mierow, *Adverbial Usage in Eugippius.* J. A. Scott, *The Assumed Duration of the War of the Iliad.* R. B. Steele, *The Future Periphrastic in Latin.* P. Shorey, *Note on Aristotle, Ethics ii. 3. 5 (1104 b 21);* S. E. Bassett, *ταρταλωθεῖς in Soph. Ant. 134,* means 'treated like Τάρταλος' 'hurled down.' J. A. Scott, *A Note on Herodotus i. 86.* The expression *σχοίνῳ διαμετρίσασθαι* is explained from II Sam. 8. 2 (LXX).

#### Vol. 9. No. 1. 1914.

B. L. Ullman, *Dramatic 'Satura.'* A discussion and interpretation of the well-known passage of Livy (VII. 2 §§ 1-12), which gives an account of the origin of both tragedy and comedy. Livy in his wish to produce a logical scheme of the

develop  
b (the i  
closely  
from th  
Fabius  
other e  
A. Shew  
case ag  
with Od  
534, 535  
the Mace  
the dep  
(2) with  
binding  
A full t  
example  
rence in  
2nd cent

Vol.  
Mar  
nine illus  
open co  
Tuscanicu  
Examine  
and Ecm  
of origin  
and Latin  
Odyssey.  
tion of H  
to Hades  
A. R. An  
for interr  
is a devel  
ne (ni).  
T. Frank  
of the Eq

Vol.  
Kend  
of the ins  
with a nev  
to patrici  
employme  
A. C. Joh  
with a sk  
On its sim  
The instar  
of the ver  
feeling. V  
Egypt. A  
ship to th  
Under Ex  
explanatio

development of the drama has brought together two pairs: *a* (the Etruscan dances), *b* (the *iocularia*, § 5); and *c* (the *saturae*, § 7), *d* (the *fabulae*, §§ 8 sqq.), which are not closely related, by linking *c* to *b*. The burlesques mentioned by Livy gain support from the account of the *pompa* of the *ludi Romani* in Dionysius Hal. VII. 72 (from Fabius Pictor). Allen B. West, *Formation of the Chalcidic League*. Numismatic and other evidence shows that there was a real Chalcidic league formed about 432. A. Shewan, *The 'Continuation' of the Odyssey*. B. *Imitation*. Summarizes the general case against the view that repetitions are marks of spuriousness; and deals in detail with *Odyssey* 24. 39 sq., 156-8, 165 sq., 235-40, 248, 368 sqq., 397 sqq., 410, 479 sqq., 534, 535 (Agar's *ὁπῆ*, *Homericæ* 152 sq.). Tenney Frank, *Representative Government in the Macedonian Republics*. On the reconstitution of Macedonia by the Romans after the deposition of Perseus (167). There was (1) a representative body (the *boule*), (2) with legislative power, (3) whose ordinances, like those of modern States, were binding over the territory. A. R. Anderson, *Studies in the Exclamatory Infinitive*. A full treatment of the construction from Naevius to Horace, supplemented by examples from prose writers of that period and the principal instances of its occurrence in Greek. Tracy Peck points out that the centre of the book-trade in the 2nd century A.D. was in the *Vicus Sandaliarius*.

Vol. 9. No. 2. 1914.

Margaret C. Waites, *The Form of the Early Etruscan and Roman House* (with nine illustrations). The Etruscan house, after the hut-stage, was built round a large open court. Some time between the First and Second Punic Wars the *Atrium Tuscanicum* was invented. G. M. Calhoun, *Documentary Frauds in Litigation at Athens*. Examined and exemplified under the heads *Wills*, *Other Private Documents*, *Depositions*, and *Ecmartyriae*, *Official Documents*, *Miscellaneous*. In actual practice the production of original documents was not regarded as very important. Francis A. Wood, *Greek and Latin Etymologies*. On fifty-nine words. A. Shewan, *The 'Continuation' of the Odyssey*. C. The NEKYIA. Defence of this against objections based on the description of Hermes as *Κυλλίνιος* and as *ψυχοπομπός*, and his conduct of the Suitors' souls to Hades before burial, the Land of Dreams of v. 11, the nine Muses of v. 60, etc. A. R. Anderson, *The Unity of the Enclitic ne*. M. Warren's theory of a dual origin for interrogative and affirmative (confirmative) *nē* cannot be maintained. The latter is a development of the former, which is to be connected with the negative particle *ne* (*ni*). A. Shewan discusses (against J. J. Drewitt) 'the Homeric Augment again.' T. Frank has a note on Pompey's 'expansionist' policy and support of the interests of the *Equites* in B.C. 70-66.

Vol. 9. No. 3. 1914.

Kendall K. Smith, *A New Fragment of the Decree of Cremonides*. Reconstruction of the inscriptions in Kirchner's revised volume of Attic inscriptions Nos. 686, 687 with a new text. Max Radin, *Gens, Familia, Stirps*. In Livy's use *gens* is restricted to patrician families; *familia* is applied to both patrician and plebeian. Cicero's employment is not quite so strict. *Stirps* is never used for a division of a 'gens.' A. C. Johnson, *Attic Archons from 294 to 262 B.C.* A new chronological arrangement with a sketch of the history of the period. J. J. Schlicher, *The Historical Infinitive*. On its simple form (denominated the *infinitivus impotentiae*) as it occurs before Sallust. The instances are collected and arranged under six heads, according to the meaning of the verbs. Its primary function is to express the effect of a strong impulse or feeling. W. L. Westermann, *Apprentice Contracts and the Apprentice System in Roman Egypt*. A connected presentation of the usages and regulations affecting apprenticeship to the various τέχναι (i.e. trades or professions) as deduced from the papyri. Under *Execution of a Vestal and Ritual Marriage* E. T. M. criticizes Miss Harrison's explanation of the ceremonial attending an erring Vestal's immurement.



**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** 1914.

June 6. H. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos* (Stählin). The carefully collected material is insufficient to enlighten us as to St. Paul's upbringing. The author's scholarship is very defective. G. Lippold, *Griechische Porträtstatuen* (Hekler). The portraits of Epicurus, Metrodorus and Hermarchus are now established.

June 13. J. Scham, *Der Optativgebrauch bei Clemens von Alexandrien* (J. H. Moulton). The frequency of the mood shows that Clemens wrote for the learned world. F. Krohn, *Vitruvii De Architectura libri decem*, ed. F. K. (Kraemer). Includes an interesting introduction.

June 20. P. Rabbow, *Antike Schriften über Seelenheilung und Seelenleitung* (Ringeltaube). This first part deals with the treatment of Anger, and shows that Seneca's treatment in Bk. 2 of the *De Ira* depends on Posidonius, and Bk. 3 is a rhetorical development of Bk. 2. W. Brewitz, *Scipio Africanus Maior in Spanien* (Grosse). A careful dissertation.

June 27. O. Hense, *L. Annaei Senecae Epistulae*, ed. O. H., and J. Buck, *Seneca De Beneficiis und De Clementia in der Ueberlieferung* (Bickel). Hense's second edition has the advantage of deducing the text of older MSS. from their later transcribers. Buck endeavours unsuccessfully to maintain the authority of the Nazarianus.

July 4. L. Laurand, *À propos d'Homère* (Max Wundt). A clear statement of the modern suspicion of Homeric criticism. W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*. 3 Aufl. (Pollak). This indispensable work is now much enlarged. A. Steiner, *Der Fiskus der Ptolemäer* (Zucker). Untrustworthy.

July 11. V. G. Jaeger, *Aristotelis De Animalium motione, De Animalium incessu; Ps.-Ar. De spiritu*; ed. V. G. J. (Mutschmann). An excellent edition by the scholar who has proved the genuineness of the *περί κινήσεως*.

July 18. J. Charpentier, *Die Desiderativbildungen der indo-iranischen Sprachen* (Güntert). Not helpful. C. Halm, *P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt*, rec. C. H., ed. quintam cur. G. Andresen. I. (Wackermann). Has collected all valuable contributions to the literature of the *Ab Excessu* of the last thirty years; includes an excellent reasoned Index Historicus.

July 25. H. Mutschmann, *Sexti Empirici opera* I., rec. H. M. (Max Wundt). This now becomes the standard edition.

Aug. 1. J. Schroeter, *Plutarchs Stellung zur Skepsis* (Falter). Shows that P.'s criticism of the senses is influenced by the physicians and the Pyrrhonists. A. Riese, *Das rheinische Germanien in den antiken Inschriften* (Drexel). Includes paraphrases of some 5,000 inscriptions, either found in Germany or referring to it.

**Hermes.** Vol. 49. Part 3. 1914.

J. Geffcken, *Die Hirten auf dem Felde*. An examination of the Virgilian, Christian and Mithraic legends of the Adoration. Virgil was influenced by Poseidonios. W. Soltau, *Der Ursprung der Diktator*. He was originally the commander-in-chief of the Romano-Latin league. Cl. Lindskog, *Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Biographien Plutarchs*. A discussion of the tradition of the text of the first section of the Lives. Contains a good analysis of typical interpolations, which are shown to be often unconscious. Chr. Jensen, *Zu dem Menanderpapyrus in Kairo*. C. Robert, *Das Oxyrhynchosblatt der Epitrepontes*. U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Der Feldzugsbericht des Ptolemaios Evergetes*. F. Jacoby, *Eine vergessene Horazemendation*. Revives the emendation 'Othone contento' in Epod. iv. 16 from the editio Veneta of 1478. W. Hoffa, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Senecas Tragödien*. A discussion of the MSS. of the interpolated A-group with notes on a number of passages. MISCELLAN. Th. Nöldeke, *ATBATANA*. A defence of the Greek spelling with the spiritus lenis. F. W. Hall, *Ad Ovid. Met. XV. 411*. Restoration of a medieval

interpo  
read av  
G. Wi  
Hymns  
not Hi

Mr  
J.  
P. H.  
Hartm  
An ut  
conside  
position  
a poet  
Patrocl  
part of  
facta s  
later w  
NEO is  
greater  
of thes  
books a  
Inscripti  
the Arc  
Leuctra  
Ciceronis  
who ma  
propera.

Ne  
R.  
of ancie  
later w  
psychol  
Menippu  
and soci  
Askalon.

XX  
A. I  
forms of  
logograp  
drine po  
Apuleius  
held to il  
'clever j  
enthusias

Rev  
G. F  
in itself i  
de Rome.  
Les Préto



interpolation in Cod. Augustanus. M. Wellmann, *Zu Philumenos* 4. 14. For ἄφρος read ἀνθρῶπος (ἄνθρωπος). F. Bechtel on Xen. *Hell.* II. 3. 10. For Ἀγγελίδας read Ἀγγελίδας. G. Wissowa, *Zu Hor.* Sat. 1. 10. 5<sup>a</sup>. Read *multum puerum*. O. Kern on Orphic Hymns 48 and 49. The conjecture that the name of the nurse of Bacchus was Hipta not Hippha, is confirmed by cod. Laurentianus 32. 45.

#### Mnemosyne. 42. 3.

J. L. V. Hartmann, *Ad Platonis Rempublicam*. Notes on text of Bks. I-V. P. H. Damsté, *Lectiones Valerianae* (cont.). Notes on text of Bks. VII.-XI. J. J. Hartmann, *Ad Plutarchi Moralia annotationes criticae*. Notes on the *De Amore Proles*, *An uitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat*, *Animine an corporis affectiones sint peiores*. H. considers authorship and points of text (to be cont.). M. Valetton, *De Iliadis compositione* (cont.). Valetton now turns to consider the *Patrocleia*, which is composed by a poet who accepts the first part of the *Achilleis*, but then brings in the motive of Patroclus' death in place of the *μηνίδος ἀπόρρητος*. To the *Patrocleia* belongs the great part of Bks. II.-X. Then he considers 'Qua maxime ratione ex Achilleide Ilias facta sit.' There is first the working together of the *Achilleis* and *Patrocleia*, with later writing conditioned by this joining, as the *κολὸς μάχη* of Θ. So most of NΞO is later than both the *Τειχοσκοπία* and *Τειχομαχία* and these than the greater part of ΓΔΕ, and all this writing is later than the *Patrocleia*. Later than any of these are the *Νυκτεργεσία* and *Δολωνεία*. And scattered over the other books are passages worked into the older material (to be cont.). W. Vollgraff, *Novae Inscriptiones Argivae*. Discusses an inscription dealing with boundaries of members of the Arcadian federation and fixes many points of topography. The date is soon after Leuctra, and the delimitation is made by the Argives as referees. J. J. H., *Ad Ciceronis ad Attic.* XIV. 18. § 1. For the unknown *Faberii* read *fabri*, the craftsman who made duplicate keys for Dolabella. *Ad Tacit.* H. 11. 25; for *prospera* read *propvera*.

#### Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. XXXIII. 6. 1914.

R. Petsch, *Die Lehre von den gemischten Gefühlen im Altertum*. A critical account of ancient views on mixed emotions, chiefly Plato's and Aristotle's, on whom all later work depends. Their faults are due to the pre-scientific roots of Greek psychology. K. Mras, *Varros Menippeische Satiren und die Philosophie*. Varro follows Menippus' form, but does not translate him. Unlike Menippus, he respects science and society, and is tolerant in philosophy, following his eclectic master Antiochus of Askalon.

#### XXXIII. 7. 1914.

A. Hausrath, *Die ionische Novellistik*. A study of the development of the shorter forms of ancient prose fiction: the early Ionic type found in Herodotus and the logographoi, akin to the folk-tale: a type reflected in the New Comedy and Alexandrine poetry: and the Aristides type, the connection of which with Petronius and Apuleius is discussed. Stress is laid on the Farnesina house paintings, which are held to illustrate a cycle of picaresque stories, mostly unknown, grouped round the 'clever judge' motive. H. F. Müller, *Plotinos über Notwendigkeit und Freiheit*. An enthusiastic exposition of Plotinus' religious and philosophic views.

#### Revue de Philologie. Vol. 38. Part 1. 1914.

G. Ramain, *Sur l'emploi de l'infinitif historique*. 'The historic infinitive does not in itself imply any idea of time.' D. Serruys, *Un fragment de la Chronique d'Hippolyte de Rome*. Pap. Oxyrhynchus 870 = Hippolytus ed. Bauer, pp. 104-107. P. Fabia, *Les Prétoriens de Vitellius*, exegetical notes on a number of passages from the *Histories*

of Tacitus. E. Cavaignac, *Polybe VI. 19. 2, et la durée du service militaire à Rome*. Supports Steinwender's view that  $\xi\zeta$  should be retained. L. Havet, *Notes critiques sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*. H. Grégoire, *Aesch. Eum.* 506 sqq. Supports  $\sigma\pi\epsilon\nu\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\pi\epsilon\nu\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . J. E. Harry, *Eur. Ion* 1424. Read  $\dot{\iota}\delta\acute{o}\upsilon$ ,  $\tau\acute{o}\delta'$   $\epsilon\sigma\theta'$   $\epsilon\psi\alpha\sigma\mu'$ — $\alpha$   $\tau'$   $\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\varsigma$   $\epsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ . R. Waltz, *Notes critiques*, on Seneca, Tacitus, Petronius.

Vol. 38. Part 2. 1914.

H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *Les personnages épisodiques dans l'Andrienne de Térence*. H. Grégoire, *Notes sur l'Hélène d'Euripide*. Reads for 390-1,  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\theta'$   $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$   $\tau\acute{o}\tau'$   $\eta\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$   $\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$   $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ ; 619,  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$  = 'to mystify.' Corrections in 1321, 1353, and in *Bacchae* 983, 1002-3. R. Cahen, *Ad Bucol.* i. 70. L. Havet, *Bucoliques* iii. 100. Reads 'Eheu, quom. . .'. L. Maries, *Diodore, 'Απὸ φωνῆς 'Αναστασίου*. The Commentary of Diodorus of Tarsus on the Psalms was provided with marginal extracts by Anastasios. G. Lafaye, *L'âne et la vigne*. In Hyginus *Fab.* 274. 1 read <uuarum> suauitatem inuenisse. G. Mathieu, *Survivances des luttes politiques du Ve siècle chez les orateurs attiques du IV<sup>e</sup>*. L. Bayard, *Notes sur la Vita Cypriani et sur Lucianus*. W. H. Buckler, *La déesse Julie*, *CIG.* 2815 et 3642. These refer to Livia, and not to Julia Domna. D. Serruys, *La notation ascendante des nombres dans la Chronique d'Eusèbe*. 'Eusèbe avait adopté l'usage palestinien de la notation ascendante, mais, dès avant le VI<sup>e</sup> siècle les copistes avaient substitué la notation descendante.'

#### Rheinisches Museum. 69. 3.

F. Jacoby, *Drei Gedichte des Properz* (cont.). Elaborate discussion of II. 24. A. (Phillimore, II. 24. 1-16), with particular reference to v. 4, where the sense requires *aut pudor ingenuus aut retinendus amor*, a true Propertian sentiment: also of III. 8, which is to be interpreted by itself and not taken closely with III. 6. E. Lattes, *A che punto siamo coll' interpretazione dei testi etruschi?* Ingenious interpretations based on closing formulae in dedicatory inscriptions. A. Schulten, *Das Pilum des Polybios*. Comparison of Polybius' account with finds in the recent excavations of Numantia. W. Bannier, *Wiederholungen bei älteren griechischen und lateinischen Autoren*. Repetitions in authors collected and classified; defence of text in some passages where repetitions occur, and warning against cutting out words which offend our taste more than the ancients'. J. M. Stahl, *Zum Aias des Sophokles*. Defends vv. 961-970 (reading  $\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\eta$  in 916) and 1105-1117; in v. 1312 read  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\omicron}$  for  $\eta\tau\omicron\hat{\omicron}$ , in 799  $\epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$   $\theta\rho\omicron\epsilon\dot{\iota}$  for  $\epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\dot{\iota}$   $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$ ; in 1081  $\pi\alpha\rho\eta$  is called for by construction of  $\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$ . J. Dietze, *Zur kyklischen Theogonie*. Argues (against Aly) that the Apollodorus version reflects a later stage of development than Hesiod. The *Titanomachy* is also later than Hesiod, and is a working over of the *Theogony* and the basis of later Orphic speculation. O. Könnicke, *Zu den griechischen Bukolikern*. Notes on Theocritus, *Epigr.* 22, *Id.* III. 28-30, VII. 5, XV. 7 (read  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$   $\alpha\dot{\iota}\epsilon\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\dot{\iota}\varsigma$  'each time you move you go further away'); XV. 15-7 (read with Ahrens  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  . . .  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\delta\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu$ ); XXVII. 20-1; *Mosch.* II. 37 sqq., on the golden basket of Europa. Notes on text of *Mosch.* II., III. and IV., of Simmias  $\Omega\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  9, 14, and of Dosiades, *Βωμός* 15, 18. O. Viedebantt, *Antike Messungen der Landenge von Suez*: all these go back to old Egyptian measuring (in  $\sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\iota$ ), very scientifically made. MISZELLEN: O. Seeck, *Das Epigramm des Germanus und seine Ueberschrift*: is not good evidence for Julian's birthday. A. Ludwig, *Zu Tryphiodorus, Zu Musaios*. Notes on text. H. Heimannsfeld, *Zum Text des Helladius bei Photius* (cod. 279). H. Schenkl, *Der Dichter der Ilias Latina*. To show real existence of Baebius Italicus. A. Klotz, *Zu Cic. pro Milone* 2. To refute Birt's assumption of a considerable lacuna. E. Hohl, *Reste einer Handschrift des Kollektaneums des Sedulius Scottus in Paris*. A. Brinkmann, *Lückenbiss*.

**Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica.** Vol. 42. No. 3. 1914.

V. Ussani, *The Earliest History of Josephus' Text* (paper read before the Congress of Orientalists at Athens in 1912). In addition to Christian and 'apologetic' interpolations already recognized in parts, Josephus' works, especially the *Bellum Iudaicum*, contain alien importations of anti-Semitic tendency, in many cases probably from the lost *History* of Pliny, used by Tacitus in his *Histories*. Interesting evidence is added from comparisons of the Greek text with the Latin version of the so-called Hegesippus and the Slav translation of Josephus. Giuseppe Procacci, *On an Episode in Silius Italicus* (VII. 162-211). The passage, an abrupt digression from the narrative, describes a manifestation of the divine power of Bacchus in very similar language to that used by Nonnos, *Dionys*. XLVII. 34 sqq. in regard to the incident of Icarius and Erigone; and it is suggested that both writers have been using the (lost) *Erigone* of Eratosthenes. P. Fossataro, *Menander's Perinthia in Terence's Andria*. F. Schöll's views on the contamination of the *Andria* of Terence from the *Andria* and *Perinthia* of Menander should be accepted. Terence took from the *Perinthia Andr.* Act I. Sc. i., the midwife scene (cf. 228, 332 = *Fragm. Per.* 397 Kock), the character of Byrria, the punishment of Davus, *Fragm. Per. Oxyrhynchus Pap.* 855 and the character of Charinus. Also probably the δόγμα 'Επικούρειον of *Andr.* 959-60. U. Moricca, *On Lucian's πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί* (conclusion). Further development of the view that it is a satire on human desires in general, with comparison of other works of Lucian and citation of parallels from Greek and Latin literature in general.

**Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.** 1914.

June 8. G. Lippold, *Griechische Porträtstatuen* (H. Lamer). 'Shows comprehensive knowledge and independent judgment.' O. Schroeder, *Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der griechischen Verswissenschaft* (J. Sitzler). O. Kraus, *Platons Hippias Minor* (H. Gillischewski). 'Rich in contents.' F. Geiger, *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipilibus* (M. Gelzer).

June 15. W. H. Roscher, *Die hippokratische Schrift von der Siebenzahl* (W. Nestle). W. H. Roscher, *Omphalos* (W. Nestle). 'A well-thought-out exposition of the evidence.' E. Obst, *Der Feldzug des Xerxes* (H. Philipp). 'Valuable.' C. Blinkenberg, *La chronique du temple Lindien* (W. Larfeld). 'The most important find at Lindos.' G. Nieschmidt, *Quatenus in scriptura Romani litteris Graecis usi sint* (N.).

June 22. A. Reinach, *L'autel rustique du Mont Phylakas, Crète* (H. Lamer). A. E. Kalischek, *De Ephoro et Theopompo Isocratis discipulis* (H. Mutschmann). A defence of the tradition. T. G. Tucker, *Plutarch, Selected Essays*, translated by T. G. T. (J. Tolkiehn). 'May well fulfil its object.'

June 29. K. F. Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (G. Friedrich). 'The introduction is suitable for school use, but not the commentary.' O. Hense, *Senecae ad Lucilium epistularum moralium quae supersunt* ed. O. H. (W. Gemoll). 'Deserves unlimited praise.' Th. Mommsen, *Epigraphische und numismatische Schriften*. I. (A. Rosenberg).

July 6. J. Schaefer, *De Jove apud Cretas culto* (H. Steuding). P. Marestaing, *Les écritures égyptiennes et l'antiquité classique* (A. Wiedemann). 'Very learned and useful.' A. Gercke, *Der Christenname ein Scheltname* (O. Stählin).

July 13. J. van Leeuwen J.F., *Ilias cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentariis exegeticis. Libri XIII.-XXIV.* (F. Stürmer). E. Ernout, *Historische Formenlehre des Lateinischen*. Deutsche Übersetzung von H. Meltzer (R. Wagner). 'A continuation to Niedermann's *Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen*.'

July 20. A. Elter, *Ein athenisches Gesetz über die eleusinische Aparche* (W. Larfeld). 'A convincing exposition.' W. Kopp, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. 9. Aufl. von M. Niemeyer (H. Gillischewski).

July 27 (double number). W. Süss, *Aristophanes, Die Frösche, mit ausgewählten antiken Scholien*, herausg. von W. S. (R. Wagner). B. Schmidt, *De Cornuti theologiae graecae compendio capita duo* (H. Steuding). P. Sternkopf, *De M. Tullii Ciceronis partitionibus oratoriis* (C. Atzert). 'Both learned and rich in results.' J. Nye, *Sentence connection, illustrated chiefly from Livy* (Ed. Wolff). 'Not without value.' G. Norlin, *The conventions of the pastoral elegy* (Ed. Wolff).

## LANGUAGE.

**Glotta.** V. Band, 4 Heft. 1914.

This number, which was published (May 27) after the appearance of the first instalment of the sixth *Band* (April 14), contains nothing but indexes and a very valuable and complete *Report* on the linguistic books and articles of 1911. One is pleased to note the ever-increasing attention paid to medieval and modern Greek and vulgar Latin, especially the numerous monographs on the language and style of individual authors. Löfstedt's *Philological Commentary on the Peregrinatio Aetheriae* and Harmon's work on *The Clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus* come in for special praise. We have the accustomed crop of etymologies, most of them unconvincing as usual. There is a striking instance of 'subjective treatment' in a German work on the criticism of Horace, which the reviewer illustrates by the following restoration of the *First Epode*: 'Ibis Liburnae creditus sub nauium | turrita propugnacula, | curas paratus Caesaris periculo | lenire, Maecenas, tuo.

**Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung.** XLVI. 1. 2.

Hans Hessen, *Beiträge zur altirischen Grammatik*. J. Charpentier, *Zur arischen Wortkunde*. Herman Lommel, *Klein- und Grossvieh*. Mainly the history of Gk. πρόβατον. H. Jacobsohn, *Lat. canēs*. The relation of the fem. nom. endings -ēs and -is. *Canēs* was preserved through being, at an early date, attached to the conson. stem. A. Fick, *Älteste griechische Stammverbände*. '... ein Versuch die Urgeschichte der ältesten Griechenstämme allein aus den Angaben der Alten herzustellen.' Herbert Petersson, *Einige Tier- und Pflanzennamen aus idg. Sprachen*. J. Pokorny, *Keltische Etymologien*; *Irische Personennamen auf -le und -re*. P. Maas, κόρταφος und κόρταλος. These forms are to be read in Plat. com. fr. 84 and Eurip. *Hypsipyle* fr. 1 respectively. F. Bechtel, *Parerga*. E. Schwyzer, *Zu den homerischen und avestischen r- n- Stämme*. In Gk. and Av. there has been a parallel extension of this type. W. Prellwitz: *Homerisch ἀμφιγυῖης* 'der Künstler.' From ἀμφιγυῖη 'dexterity' abstract to ἀμφίγυος. F. Edgerton, *Vedic sabhā* is sm-bhā = col-loquium. F. Holthausen, *Lateinische Etymologien*. R. Trautman, *Got. mag und slav. mogo*. The latter is not a Germanic loanword. W. Schulze, *Ueber einige Collectiva*. *Vangio* in C.I.L. vi, 31149 refers to the country of origin (*Vangiones* = *Wortmatianses*).

AGHNA  
transp  
-aio and  
accusati

admissio

adoratio  
Aeneid,  
aeque ut  
Agamem

259

4

Agamem

Aithiopi

Alcibiad

altars of

ancient l

Anderso

Antenor

Antonius

aorists re

Apolloni

Arethas,

Aristoge

'ascendi

Asconius

Atellana

Athena,

Athenian

Athens a

290

Atticism

authentic

authorsh

lime, 1



# INDICES

## I.—GENERAL INDEX.

### A.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ, xxx. 3-4, a suggested transposition, 13 ff.  
 -aior and -eior in Latin poetry, 66  
 accusative, adverbialized, 229  
     of exclamation, 61  
 admission of provincials to the senate, 132 f., 282 ff.  
     policy of Augustus or Tiberius regarding, 285 f.  
     speech of Claudius on, 282 ff.  
 adoration of the shepherds, the, 292  
*Aeneid*, authenticity of first seven lines of, 134  
*aeque ut*, not in Golden Latin, 147 f.  
*Agamemnon*, notes on the, 1 ff.  
     259 sqq., 1 f.; 427, 536, 2 f.; 831, 3 f.; 1028, 4 f.; 1321, 5; 1536, 5 f.; 1651, 6  
 Agamemnon does not suspect Clytemnestra, 3 f.  
*Aithiopsis*, the, 139  
 Alcibiades, 77  
 altars of ἄγνων θεῶν, 222  
 ancient handwriting, 68  
**Anderson (W. B.)**, notes on Lucan VIII., 105 ff.  
 Antenor, 17  
 Antonius Julianus and Tacitus, 67  
 aorists referring to future, 74  
 Apollonius Rhodius, notes on, 66  
     Tyrius, 220  
 Arethas, 231  
 Aristogeiton, 78  
 'ascending notation' in Eusebius, 294  
 Asconius, MS. of, 68  
*Atellanae*, the, 140  
 Athena, provenance of, 290  
 Athenian archers, the, 67  
 Athens and other Attic place-names pre-Hellenic, 290  
 Atticisms in Ionic inscriptions, 217  
 authenticity of *Aeneid* I. 1-7, 134  
     the *Halientica*, 267  
     the NEKTIA, 291  
     the Pseudo-Vergiliana, 123 ff.  
     the *Rhesus*, 211  
 authorship of the anonymous treatise *On the Sublime*, 137  
     'Plato's' first letter, 64

### B.

Baebius Italicus, 294  
 Baehrens on Latin Syntax, 72  
 battle of Oenoe, date of, 141  
*Bellum Gallicum*, the text of, and the work of 11.  
     Meusel, 156 ff.  
**Bennett (Charles E.)**, notes on Horace, 145 ff.  
 birth-star, influence of the, 258  
 Boethus of Sidon, 88 ff.  
     Sidon had two Boethi, (a) a Peripatetic, (b) a Stoic, 89  
     heresies of the Stoic Boethus, 89  
     their respective dates, 89 f.  
**Booker (S. C.)**, note on Thucydides vii. 28. 3. 104  
 Boulé, functions of the, 14  
 Brugmann's *Grundriss*, radical change of plan, 72  
**Burnett (John)**, *Vindiciae Platonicae* I., 230 ff.  
**Butcher (W. G. D.)**, the caesura in Virgil, and its bearing on the authenticity of the Pseudo-Vergiliana, 123 ff.  
 butting calf, the, a poetical commonplace, 270

### C.

Caesar uses passive to describe duration of battle, 161  
 caesura, the, in Virgil, and its bearing on the authenticity of the Pseudo-Vergiliana, 123 ff.  
     treatment of the, by Ennius, 141  
 Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius, 65  
 Catullus and Mallius, 216  
     dates of birth and death, 222  
 Celsus, 219  
 Chalcidic League, 291  
 chronology of the Fronto correspondence, 112 ff.  
     Ovid's works, 63  
     Polybius' *History*, 139  
 Cicero, MSS. of, 68  
**Clapp (E. B.)**, on certain fragments of Pindar, 225 ff.  
**Clark (R. T.)**, notes on Dares and Dictys, 17 ff.  
 Claudian's 'prefaces,' 217  
 Claudius and the *primores Galliae*, 132 f., 282 ff.



- Clement's *Stromateis*, on the text of, 237 ff.  
 omissions of two kinds prime cause of  
 errors in, 237, 239  
 passages transposed in, 240  
 quotations in, 244  
 repetitions in, 239 f.  
 colony of *Nouum Comum*, the, 66  
**Colson (F. H.)**, the grammatical chapters in Quintilian I. (4-8), 33 ff.  
 composition of the *Iliad*, 138, 221, 293  
*Consolatio ad Liuiam*, date of, 63  
**Cunningham (H. J.)**, Claudius and the *primores Galliae*, 132 f.  
 'Cupid and Psyche,' story not a folk-tale, 220  
*Curculio*, MS. of the, 216

## D.

- Dares and Dictys, notes on, 17 ff.  
 date of battle of Oenoe, 141  
   birth and death of Catullus, 222  
   *Consolatio ad Liuiam* and *Elegiae ad Maecenatem*, 63  
   *Epigrammi Cysici*, 61  
   Eurip. *Cyclops*, *Andromeda*, *Helena*, 142  
   Soph. *Ichneutae*, 141  
 'datus sympatheticus,' 62  
 defeated gladiators saved by Emperor's intervention, 263  
 Democritus, a gnomic work by, 65  
 dictator, origin of the, 292  
 Dictys, notes on, 19 ff.  
 digamma, did Plato write the? 236  
 Dionysius Thrax on relation of 'grammar' to *γραμματική*, 34  
 Dionysus, religion of, 134  
**Dobson (J. F.)**, Boethus of Sidon, 88 ff.  
 Domitia Lucilla, 114, 117  
 Donatius' letter to L. Munatius, 68  
 Doric  $\alpha$  in Attic Tragedy, 141

## E.

- Elegiae ad Maecenatem*, date of, 63  
 'enantiosemeia,' 223  
 Ennius in the Middle Ages, 61  
   his treatment of the caesura, 141  
*Epigrammi Cysici*, their date and relation to Greek tragedy, 61  
 'epistolary tenses' in Latin, 135  
*Erigone* of Eratosthenes, the, 295  
 Etruscan house, the, 291  
 etymologies and derivations (E. W. Fay), 50 ff.  
 Eumolpus, 264  
 Euripides' *Cyclops*, *Andromeda*, *Helena*, date of, 142  
 Eurystheus, brother to Medusa, 257  
 Euthyphron a heretic, 233

## F.

- Farnesina house-paintings, 293  
 Faustina, 113 f., 116  
 Fauorinus *περὶ παίδων τροφῆς*, 64

- Fay (Edwin W.), etymologies and derivations, 50 ff.  
 Fortuna in Lucan, 107 ff.  
 Fronto's correspondence, 112 ff.  
   date of his consulship, 112

## G.

- Gallie chieftains and the *latus clauus*, 287  
**Garrod (H. W.)**, 'salapantium disertum,' 48 f.  
   notes on the *Naturales Quaestiones* of Seneca, 272 ff.  
 Gellius (xxi. 1) derives from Chrysippus, 64  
 Gemini, the constellation, 257  
 genitive after  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon$ ,  $\delta\epsilon\rho\chi\omega$  etc., 224  
 Gercke's text of Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones*, 272 ff.  
 Geryon, myth of, 226 ff.  
**Goodell (Thomas D.)**, XPH and  $\Delta\epsilon\iota$ , 91 ff.  
**Gow (A. S. F.)**, notes on the *Agamemnon*, 1 ff.  
 'Grammar,' ancient definitions and divisions of, 33 ff.  
 grammarians of the Empire, their influence on the Roman codes and Catholic Creeds, 47  
 grammatical chapters in Quintilian, the (i. 4-8), 33 ff.  
   history of the two-fold division of *grammatica*, 33 ff.  
   Q.'s treatment of grammar proper, 36 ff.  
   of literary branch of *grammatica*, 41 ff.  
   work and influence of the grammarians of the Empire, 47  
 grammatical classifications of Quintilian, Cicero, Philo, Dionysius Thrax, Varro, 33 ff.  
 Greek heroic sagas, 222  
   romances, 293

## H.

- Haines (C. R.)**, on the chronology of the Fronto correspondence, 112 ff.  
*Haliectica*, authenticity of the, 267 ff.  
   metrical peculiarities due to vulgar Greek pronunciation, 268 f.  
**Hall (F. W.)**, a false quotation from Plautus, 205  
**Hardy (E. G.)**, Claudius and the *primores Galliae*; a reply and a restatement, 282 ff. (see also 132 ff.)  
**Harrison (E.)**, verse-weight, 206 ff.  
   table of percentages of iambs and spondees in melic, tragic and comic trimeters, 207  
   four rules for proportion of iambs to spondees in the tragedians, 208  
   bearing of results on (a) authenticity of the *Rhesus*, (b) Porson's Law, 209 ff.  
 Headlam on the *Agamemnon*, criticized, 3, 5  
 Hebraisms in N. T. Greek, 203 f.  
 Hellenistic art in Syria, 138 f.  
   Greek, reconstructed by study of Modern, 187 f.  
 Hellenotamiae, functions of, 14  
 Herodes Atticus, 113, 115  
 Hesiod's *Theogony*, the prooemium to, 138  
 Hipta, nurse of Bacchus, 293  
 historic infinitive, 291, 293

Holmes (C.)  
 and the  
 Homer:

'Homeric  
 Horace,

Housman  
 151 ff.

iamb, p  
 trimete  
 In Memo  
 initiatio  
 inscripti

interpol

Isidore,

Josephus  
 Julia, th

Knigt  
 palim  
 Kyd (A  
 decad

Lacedae  
 land sys  
 LANGU  
 144.  
 Leoprep  
 Leucon  
 Licinius  
 LITERA  
 PERI  
 furth  
 literary  
 Livy or

Livy's  
 palin

AOTOT

ions, 50 ff.

**Holmes (T. Rice)**, the text of the *Bellum Gallicum* and the work of H. Meusel, 156 ff.

**Homer** :

*Iliad*, composition of, 138, 221, 293

interpolations in, 289

meteorology of, 212 ff.

*Odyssey*, indifference to natural phenomena in, *ib.*

'Homeric hymn,' traces of, in Hesiod, 68

Horace, notes on, 145 ff.

*Odes*, i. 3. 1 *sqq.*, 145 f.; i. 12. 45 *sqq.*,

146 f.; i. 16. 5 *sqq.*, 147 f.; ii. 18. 7,

148 ff.

i. 14 a *propempticum* for Octavian,

69

**Housman (A. E.)**, a transposition in Propertius, 151 ff.

### I.

iamb, percentages of, in melic, tragic and comic trimeters, 207 ff.

In Memoriam Alastair Hope Kyd, 253

initiation, the Spartan Cryptia the final stage of, 67

inscription, a new Argive, 293

at Lindus, 63, 295

interpolations in the *Iliad*, 289

in Josephus, 295

Isidore, MSS. of, 137

### J.

Josephus, interpolations in, 295

Julia, the elder and younger, 25

### K.

**Knight (Clara M.)**, the importance of the Veronese palimpsest in the first decade of Livy, 166 ff.

**Kyd (A. H.)**, the *codex Bambergensis* of the first decade of Livy, 248 ff.

in *memoriam* notice, 253

### L.

Lacedaemonian Cryptia, the, 67

land system in Thessaly, 135

LANGUAGE : SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 71 f.,

144, 224, 296. See further under 'Summaries.'

Leoprepides, 257

Leucon, 255

Licinius, the Emperor, 67

LITERATURE AND GENERAL : SUMMARIES OF

PERIODICALS, 61 ff., 134 ff., 216 ff., 289 ff. See

further under 'Summaries.'

literary dialect in Modern Greek, 184 f.

Livy on origins of tragedy and comedy, 290 f.

epitome of, 65

Livy's first decade, importance of the Veronese palimpsest in, 166 ff.

*codex Bambergensis* of, 248 ff.

ΛΟΓΟΣ, on the Aristotelian use of, a reply, 9 ff.

objections to Cook Wilson's view (*C.R.*

June, 1914) that λόγος means 'reason'

in certain passages of *Nic. Eth.*, 9 f.

another interpretation stated, 10 ff.

Lucan VIII., notes on, 105 ff.

Lucan's fondness for rhetorical questions without introductory particles, 106

repetitions, intentional and unconscious, 110 f.

reproaches of the gods, 109 f.

use of a 'pregnant' construction, 107

Lucian's *πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί*, 295

speeches on Phalaris, 65

Lucretius, MSS. of, 147

*Iudi*, corrupting influence of the, 25

Luxemburg MS. of the *Moretum*, 103 ff.

### M.

Macedonian republics, 291

trophies, 221

**Macurdy (G. H.)**, rainbow, sky and stars in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 212 ff.

Maecenas's relation to Caesar, 153 f.

MSS. of Asconius, 68

*Bellum Gallicum*, 157 ff.

Cicero, 68

*Curculio*, 216

Fronto, 112, 119 f.

Isidore, 137

Livy, 166 ff., 248 ff.

Lucretius, 141

*Moretum*, 103 f.

Ovid's *Tristia*, 21

Plato, 230 ff.

Seneca, 68, 140, 142, 272, 292

Marcus Aurelius, 112 ff.

date of his children's births, 113 f.

marriage, 113

Massiliots discover Britain, 64

Menaechmus, 68

Menander's *Andria* and *Perinthia* the sources of

Terence's *Andria*, 295

vocabulary, 219

*mensae paniceae*, 66

meteorological phenomena, their prominence in the *Iliad*, 212 ff.

Meusel's work on the text of the *Bellum Gallicum*, 156 ff.

miasma of homicide, 233

Milan MS. of Seneca's 'Dialogues,' 140

Modern Greek, its value for the study of Ancient Greek, 181 ff.

erroneous theory of development, 185

key to written and spoken *κοινή*, 187 ff.

new literary idiom, 184 f.

sound-changes in, 182 ff.

Momos in the *Kypria*, 236

moon and stars in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 214

*Moretum*, a neglected MS. of the, 103

**Munro (J. A. R.)**, 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία (xxx. 3. 4).

13 ff.

music in the Roman Army, 221

mythical names, 71

### N.

names of barbarian tribes in Ovid, 24

Neaera as a common name, 121 f.

*Nekuia*, authenticity of the, 291  
 Nero's literary circle, 216  
 Nettleship on Quintilian's borrowings from Palaemon and Pliny, 36 ff.  
 new codex of Seneca's *Epistles*, 68, 142

## O.

*Odyssey*, the, differs from the *Iliad* by indifference to celestial phenomena, 212 ff.  
 omission of *tu* and *ego* in poetry, 155  
 Orphic anthropogony, an, 66  
 orthography, 69  
 -ov scanned long before vowel, 226  
 Ovid, echoes Menander, 141  
     his fondness for three illustrations, 261  
     influenced by Stoic physics, 247  
     notes on the *Ibis*, *Ex Ponto Libri*, and *Halieutica*, 254 ff.  
     some passages of the *Tristia*, 21 ff.  
 Owen (S. G.), notes on Ovid's *Ibis*, *Ex Ponto Libri*, and *Halieutica*, 254 ff.  
     on some passages of Ovid's *Tristia*, 21 ff.

## P.

Paeon of Philodamos of Scarpheia, the, 288  
 palimpsest, the Fronto, 112, 119 f.  
     the Veronese, of Livy, 166 ff.  
 Palladius, word-formation in, 68  
 Peleus at Troy with Heracles, 225 f.  
 Perilla, 22, 26 f.  
 Phaidros, emendations in Plato's, 7 f.  
 Phalaris, Lucian's speeches on, 65  
 Philetas, a poem of, 223  
 Phoenix of Colophon, 140  
 Pinarus, the river, 218  
 Pindar, emendations in, 225, 226  
     on certain fragments of, 225 ff.  
 Platt (Arthur), Theocritea, 86 f.  
 Plautus, a false quotation from, 205  
 Polybius, chronology of, 139  
 Porson's Law, 208, 211, 219  
 Postgate (J. P.), Neaera as a common name, 121 f.  
     on the text of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, 237 ff.  
 Powell (J. U.), the Paeon of Philodamos of Scarpheia, 288  
     'pregnant' construction, 107  
*primores Galliae*, the, 132 f., 282 ff.  
 Procopius, interpolations in, 222  
*Prometheus Vincit*, 217  
 Propertius, a transposition in, 151 ff.  
 pseudo-Phocylides, Jewish and Essene sources of, 68  
 Ptolemais tribe at Athens, the, 134

## Q.

quantities of Chione, Chionides, 264  
     of proper names, poetic license with regard to, 29 f.  
 Quintilian, the grammatical chapters in (i. 4-8), 33 ff.

## R.

rainbow, sky and stars in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 212 ff.  
 Rhegium, derivation of, 142  
*Rhesus*, authenticity of the, 65, 211  
     peculiar rhythm in, 206  
 Rhine, Caesar's description of the, 158 f.  
 Rhinthon's *Ἰσχυροπαιδιαι*, 26  
 Richards (H.), Thucydidea (*continued*), 73 ff.  
 river-gods represented in triumphs, 264  
 Roberts (W. Rhys), note on Thucydides ii. 48. 3, 16  
 Rufinus, 221

## S.

St. Paul's speech on the Areopagus, 222  
 'salapantium disertum,' 48 f.  
 Samnites, 142  
 Sappho, the new ode, 221  
 scholia to Plato, 230 f.  
 Scopas the Aleuad, 257  
 Seneca, MSS. of, 68, 140, 142, 272, 292  
     notes on the *Naturales Quaestiones* of, 272 ff.  
 Seneca's *de Ira*, 292  
     influence on Neronian poets, 216  
 shortening of diphthongs in Greek and Latin poetry, 27 f.  
     of long vowels in vulgar Latin, 268  
 Sicyonian chronology, 68  
 Simonides and the Dioscuri, 257 f.  
 snow in the *Iliad*, 214  
 Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, date of, 141  
     notes on, 61  
 sound-changes in Modern Greek, 182 f.  
 Souter (A.), a neglected manuscript of the *Moretum*, 103  
 spondee, percentages of, in melic, tragic and comic trimeters, 206 ff.  
 Stocks (J. L.), on the Aristotelian use of ΛΟΓΟΣ: a reply, 9 ff.  
 Stoic comparison of Wise Man to sphere, 246  
 doctrine of the central sphere, 246 f.  
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 61 ff., 134 ff., 216 ff., 289 ff.  
     American Journal of Philology, 61, 134, 216, 289  
     Athenaeum (Pavia), 61, 134, 216  
     Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 62 f., 134 ff., 217 f., 289 f.  
     Classical Philology, 290 ff.  
     Classical Weekly, 64, 136 f., 218 f.  
     Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 64 f., 137 f., 219, 292  
     Glotta, 71 f., 144, 224, 296  
     Hermathena, 65  
     Hermes, 65, 138, 219 f., 292 f.  
     Indogermanische Forschungen, 72, 144, 224  
     Journal of Philology, 66  
     Mnemosyne, 66, 138, 220, 293  
     Musée Belge, 220

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS—continued.

- Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alter-  
tum, etc., 66 f., 138 f., 220 f., 293 f.  
Philologus, 67, 139, 221 f.  
Revue de Philologie, 140 f., 294  
Revue des Études grecques, 67, 221  
Rheinisches Museum, 68, 141 f., 222, 294  
Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica,  
68 f., 142, 222 f., 295  
Wiener Studien, 69  
Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie,  
70 f., 142 f., 223 f., 295 f.  
Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachfor-  
schung, 144, 296  
ὀπρὲς *Technopaegnium*, the, 66

## T.

- Tasgetius, assassination of, 161  
tautology in Latin poetry, 110 f.  
teaching of literature in Roman schools, 46 f.  
Theocritea, 86 f.  
Terence's *Andria*, sources of, 295  
Theogony, the Cyclic, 294  
    prooemium to Hesiod's, 138  
*Thesaurus Dialecti Ionicae*, a proposed, 62  
three illustrations of a maxim, an Ovidian trait,  
261  
Thucydidea, Part II. Miscellaneous emendations  
(continued), 73 ff.  
Thucydides, note on ii. 48. 3, 16; on vii. 28. 3,  
104  
**Thumb (Albert)**, on the value of Modern Greek for  
the study of Ancient Greek, 181 ff.  
thunderbolts wielded by nine gods, 281  
*trahere*, different meanings of, 25, 148 ff.  
transposition, examples of, 155  
    in 'Αθ. Πολ. xxx. 3-4, 13 ff.  
    in Propertius iii. 9, 151 ff.  
trimeter verse, percentages of iambs and spondees  
in, 207 ff.  
Tsaconian dialect, 186

## V.

- Varro and Menippus, 293  
Varro's divisions of *enarratio poetarum*, 41  
    of *grammatica*, 34  
Velleius, 140  
verbals in -*τέος*, 93  
Veronese palimpsest of first decade of Livy, charac-  
teristic errors of, 167-172  
    importance of, 166 ff.  
    true readings preserved by, 177 ff.  
    variant readings and glosses in, 172-177  
'verse-weight,' 206 ff.  
Vicus Sandaliarius, 291  
**Viljoen (H. G.)**, emendations in Plato's *Phaidros*, 7 f.  
Vindiciae Platonicae I., 230 ff.  
Virgil, mosaic picture of, 134  
Virgil's treatment of the caesura, 123 ff.  
vulgar Greek pronunciation reflected in Latin  
literature, 269

## X.

- XPH and ΔΕΙ, 91 ff.  
    historical development of two synonyms,  
    91-3  
    their use in Aeschylus, Euripides, Sopho-  
    cles, 95 f.  
    Aristotle, 102  
    Herodotus, 97 f.  
    Homer, 93 f.  
    orators, Xenophon, 100  
    Pindar and Bacchylides, 94  
    Plato, 101 f.  
    Pre-Socratics, 96 f.  
    Thucydides, 98 ff.

## Z.

- Zamolxis an epithet, 67  
Zeus, physical aspect of, preponderates in the *Iliad*,  
213  
    Thaulios, 61, 134

## II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

### A.

#### Aeschylus :—

*Ag.* (259 *sqq.* coll. 187, 228 *sqq.*, 435 *sqq.*) 1 f.; (427 *sq.* coll. Ach. Tat. vi. 6, Eumath. iii. 7) 2; (536 *sqq.* coll. Ch. 301) 2 f.; (831) 3 f.; (1028 *sqq.* coll. Theogn. 543, 945; Soph. *fr.* 421; Eur. *Ion* 1514; Plaut. *Mil.* 348) 4 f.; (1321 *sq.*) 5; (1536 *sq.* coll. Ch. 643, 909; *Eum.* 169=174) 5; (1651 *sq.* coll. Suidas s. v. *πρόκωρος*; Eur. *Or.* 1477; *Eum.* 595; Eur. *Phoen.* 363) 6; *Eum.* (506 *sqq.*) 294

#### Aëtius :—

*Plac.* (I. 6 coll. Diog. Laert. vii. 148), 246; (ii. 2. coll. *Herc. Frag.* Arnim II. no. 1059; schol. Hom. *Il.* Ψ. 65; Lucan 9. 9. Hieronym. *Ep.* 108. 23; Marc. Aurel. 12. 3; Id. 8-41, 11. 12; Hor. *S.* ii. 7. 56) *ib.*; (iii. 9. 3) *ib.*

#### Apollonius Rhodius :—

*Argonaut.* (i. 936; ii. 368; iii. 158; iv. 786) 66

#### Aristotle :—

*'Aθ.* *IIol.* (xxx. 3-4. coll. xxix. 3, xxxi. 2, lvi. 1) 13 ff.

*Nic. Eth.* (1106 b 36; coll. 1139 a 18; 1139 b 16; *de An.* 435 b 16; *Pol.* 1235 a 23; *N.E.* 1115 b 22; *ib.* 1166 a 10; *ib.* 1170 a 16; *de Caelo* 293 b 13; *ib.* 297 b 34; *Phys.* 219 a 22) 9 f.

*de Part. An.* (639 b 11-19; coll. 1140 b 5; 640 a 31; 1144 b 27; 1107 a 1; *N.E.* II. iv.; *ib.* VI. iv.; *N.E.* vi. 1139 a 31; *N.E.* ii. 1103 b 31; Aspasius [ed. Heylbut, 48, 20]) 10 f.

### C.

*C I G.* (2815, 3642) 294

#### Caesar :—

*Bell. Gall.* iv. 10 (coll. iii. 28, 1; vi. 24; vii. 77, 14; ii. 29, 4; *ib.* 30. 4) 158 ff.

#### Callimachus :—

*Hymn. ad Apoll.* (105-113 coll. Anth. Pal. xl. 275) 65

#### Catullus :—

(liiii. 5 coll. Plaut. *Curc.* 463) 48 f.

#### Cicero :—

*ad Att.* xiv. (18. 1) 293

*ad Fam.* vii. (12. 1) 140; xv. (20) 290

#### Clement of Alexandria :—

*Strom.* vii. 45 *sq.* (coll. Aët. *Plac.* i. 6; ii. 2; iii. 9. 3; *Herc. Frag.* Arnim ii. no. 1059; schol. Hom. *Il.* Ψ. 65; Lucan 9. 9; Hieronym. *Ep.* 108. 23; Marc. Aurel. 12. 3; id. 8. 41; 11. 12; Hor. *S.* II. 7. 56; Achilles *Isagoge* 4; Plut. *de fac. in orbe lunae* c. 6. p. 923 E; Ov. *Fast.* 6. 169 *sqq.*) 245 ff.

### D.

#### Dares :—

(C. i. p. 2, 12; C. ii. p. 3, 25; C. iii. p. 5, 12; 13; C. iv. p. 5, 24; C. viii. p. 10, 7, 18; C. xi. p. 14, 5; C. xviii. p. 23, 3) 17; (C. xx. p. 25, 26; C. xxi. p. 26, 19, 23; C. xxvii. p. 22, 1, 18; C. xxvii. p. 33, 15; C. xxviii. p. 34, 19; C. xxxvi. p. 44, 3; C. xxxvii. p. 44, 21; C. xli. p. 49, 9, 20) 18; (C. xlii. p. 51, 8) 19

#### Dictys :—

I. (C. ii. p. 4, 9) 19; (C. viii. p. 7, 19) 19; (C. xxiii. p. 17, 31) 19; II. (C. xxviii. p. 36, 15) 19; (C. xlii. p. 45, 17) 19; III. (C. iii. p. 53, 33) 19; (C. xxiii. p. 59, 26, p. 66, 13) 19 f.; V. (C. vii. p. 92, 18) 20; (C. xvi. p. 100, 10) 20; VI. (C. ii. p. 103, 15) 20

#### Diogenes Laertius :—

vii. (54) 90

### E.

#### Euripides :—

*Cyclops* (694) 191

*Helena* (390 *sq.*, 619) 294

*Ion* (1424) 294

### H.

#### Herodorus :—

F. H. G. (ii. 34) 138

#### Herodotus :—

i. (86) 290

#### Hesiod :—

*Theogony* (1-115) 138

#### Horace :—

*Epod.* iv. (16) 292

*Odes* i. (3, 1 *sqq.* coll. Cato *de Agr.* 70, 2; Mart. ix. 99, 1 *sqq.*) 145 f. (12, 45 *sq.* coll.

Lauret. i. 314, Hor. *Epod.* i. 1, 80) 146 f.; (16, 5 *sqq.* coll. Varro *Sent.* 26; Cic. *Phil.*

ii.  
Ap  
190  
ib  
Ho  
Sat.  
Hyginus :  
Fab.

Index Her

Livy :—

vii. (2)

Lucan :—

viii.

i. 2

156

106

Geo

635

124

793

vi.

39

fin.

625

216

Manilius :—

i. (28)

Marius Vi

K. vo

Nonius :—

(p. 17)

Ovid :—

ex Po

101

(7.

II.

A.

53

Lat

coll

94.

v.

coll

iii.

xv.

i. 7

Halie

7 :

Con

His

271

libi (

140



ii. 94: Sen. Rhetor, *Cont. Exc.* 4, 8; Apul. *Apol.* 14) 147 f.; ii. (18, 7 coll. Varro, *fr.* 190, B; Juv. ii. 54 *sqq.*; Ov. *Met.* xiv. 264; *ib.* xiii. 511; *ib.* ii. 411; Id. *Her.* iii. 75; Hor. *A. P.* 215) 148 ff.

Sat. i. (10. 5<sup>a</sup>) 293

Hyginus:—

*Fab.* (274. 1) 294

I.

*Index Herculanensis* (Col. LI. ll. 7-9) 89

L.

Livy:—

vii. (2. 1-12) 290

Lucan:—

viii. (5 *sqq.*, 102 *sqq.*) 105 f.; (306-10 coll. i. 299 *sqq.*, iii. 137 *sq.*, iv. 215-219, vi. 153-156, 326 *sq.*, ix. 1073-1076, viii. 793-796) 106; (701-708 coll. Liv. ix. 20. 5; Verg. *Georg.* ii. 505) 107 f.; (663-667 coll. 622-635, 642, 861) 108 f.; (858-861 coll. i. 121-124; iv. 799 *sqq.*; viii. 548 *sq.*, 713 *sq.*, 793 *sqq.*) 109 f.; (717-720 coll. Verg. *Aen.* vi. 152, 460; *ib.* ix. 337 *sq.*; Catull. lxvi. 39; Liv. ix. 2. 8 *sq.*; Luc. i. 82, 93; ii. *fin.*; iv. 264, 292, 426, 448 *sqq.*, viii. 570, 625, 631, 793, 796) 110 f.; ix. (980-986) 216

M.

Manilius:—

i. (285) 222

Marius Victorinus:—

K. vol. vi. (p. 4) 34; (*ib.*) 35

N.

Nonius:—

(p. 172, Lindsay), 48

O.

Ovid:—

*ex Ponto* I. (i. 65-66 coll. ii. 2. 24, *A. A.* ii. 101) 258 f.; (7. 21-22 coll. i. 9. 49) 259 f.; (7. 65-66 coll. ii. 1. 4, Cic. *Off.* i. § 48) 260; II. (2. 31-38 coll. ii. 5. 61; *Am.* i. 2. 9; *A. A.* ii. 177; *Med. faciei* 37) 261 ff.; (8. 53 coll. Suet. *Iul.* 26, Seneca ap. *Anth. Lat.* P. L. M. iv. 25, 27) 263; III. (3. 41 coll. *Met.* xi. 301) 264; (4. 89, coll. 94, 114) 264; (4. 107 *sq.* coll. Plin. *N. H.* v. 37; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 41) 264; (5. 49 coll. *Met.* viii. 172) 264; IV. (4. 27-34 coll. iii. 5. 47; *Fast.* iv. 54, 415; *Met.* iv. 734, xv. 126; Liv. xxi. 60) 265; (8. 85 *sq.* coll. i. 7. 13; iv. 10. 71) 265 f.; (16) 266 f. *Halieut.* (2 coll. *Am.* iii. 13. 15; Juv. xii. 7; Mart. iii. 58. 11, vi. 38. 8; Claud. iv. *Cons. Honor.* 383) 269 f.; (53-57 coll. Tac. *Hist.* i. 14) 271; (65, 67 coll. Liv. ix. 9. 14) 271 *Ibis* (131-132 coll. *A. A.* ii. 113) 254; (137-140 coll. *ex P.* i. 2. 90) 254; (289 *sq.* coll.

Aesch. *P. V.* 10) 255; (307 *sq.*) 255; (413-416 coll. 203; *Am.* iii. 6. 101) 256; (445 *sq.* coll. *Heroid.* ix. 7; *ex P.* i. 6. 38, ii. 5. 6) 256 f.; (509 *sq.* coll. Juv. vii. 194; Manil. iii. 58 *sqq.*) 257 f.

*Tristia* I. (i. 47, 48; coll. Verg. *Georg.* iii. 390; Livy i. 30; Juv. viii. 95; Seneca *Dial.* i. 3. 3) 21 f.

II. (77-80: coll. ii. 379; iii. 4. 71; *Pont.* i. 76; *Ibis* 639) 22; (83-86) 22 f.; (ii. 89-92: coll. Tac. *Ann.* i. 74; Cic. *pro Mur.* § 87) 23; (ii. 109-114) 23 f.; (191-192 coll. Plin. *N. H.* vi. 19) 24; (253-254 coll. *Pont.* iii. 2. 14; *Ars Am.* iii. 421) 24 f.; (ii. 277-278, 279-282) 25; (ii. 409-410) 25 f.

III. (i. 47) 26; (3. 21) 26; (7. 27-28 coll. Cic. *c. Rull.* ii. 91; Verg. *Aen.* i. 382) 26 f.; (10. 11-12 coll. *Pont.* i. 5. 51; i. 3. 35; *Her.* 16. 32) 27; (12. 1-2 coll. Plaut. *Asin.* 333; Eur. *Herc.* 348-450; Soph. *Antig.* 1131) 27 f.

IV. (10. 79-80 coll. Stat. *Silu.* v. 1. 221, *Theb.* xii. 246; Lucan viii. 849) 30

V. (1. 69-72 coll. *Pont.* i. 1. 19; *Ars Am.* iii. 108; *Her.* 9. 129; *Metam.* i. 585; Hor. *Carm.* iii. 5. 42) 30 f.; (10. 41-42 coll. *Metam.* ix. 768, xii. 57) 31; (12. 11 coll. v. 13. 8; Lucr. v. 909) 31 f.; (12. 49-50) 32

P.

Persius:—

i. (99-102) 216

Philo:—

*de Congressu* (4) 34; (26) *ib.*

*de Ab. et Caini* (22) 34

Philodemos of Scarpheia:—

*Paeon* (ll. 53-56) 288

Philumenos:—

4. (14) 293

Pindar:—

*Fr.* 172 (coll. *Fr.* 227; O. i. 36 *sqq.*; O. 2, 23 *sqq.*; O. 7, 26 *sqq.*; O. 9, 28 *sqq.*; P. 3, 54 *sqq.*; P. 4, 133; N. 4. 25; I. 6, 27; *Fr.* 50, 51; P. 3, 93 *sqq.*) 225 f.; *fr.* 177, 4 (coll. O. 13, 35; P. 1, 39) 226; *Fr.* 169 (coll. Plat. *Laws*, vii. 795 C; Aesch. *Ag.* 857-862; I. i. 13; *Fr.* 81; Strabo iii. 148, 11; Apollod. 2, 5, 10; Hes. *Theog.* 287 *sqq.*; Athen. 8, 346; 2 Smyrn. 6, 196 b; Pind. *N.* 1, 62 *sqq.*) 226 ff.; *Fr.* 235 (coll. I. 3, 7; P. 11, 12; N. 1, 4 *sqq.*; P. 3, 95; N. 11, 16; P. 2, 84; Ar. *Wasps* 338; Hom. *Od.* 21, 71) 229

Plato:—

*Euthyphro* (2a, 5: 3a, 1: 3e, 2: 4a, 12) 232 f.; (4b, 10: 4e, 2: 5b, 4: 5e, 6) 233 f. (5d, 4: 5e, 2: 7e, 2) 234 f.; (9d, 2: 11b, 7: 11e, 3: 12a, 9) 235 f.; (14c, 3: 16a, 3) 236

*Phaedr.* (230d, coll. *Gorg.* 511e) 7; (236c, coll. Soph. O. R. 47) 7 f.



ii. 24) 86 ;  
i. 41 coll.

) 16  
3: 17. 2:  
27. 2: 40.  
ib. 2: 71.  
: 89: 95:  
3) 75  
8. 3: 10.  
2: 13. 1:  
6: 21. 2  
9: 35. 1;  
3: 54. 3:  
2: ib. 3:  
1: 85. 3:

1: ib. 7:  
4: (29. 5:  
49. 3: 51.  
75. 4: ib.  
4: 86. 3:  
  
27. 2: 46.  
2: 56. 3)  
63. 4: 64.  
75. 3: 86.  
9: ib. 11:  
5

### III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

#### A.—GREEK.

ΑΓΒΑΤΑΝΑ, 292  
ἀγλαοφῶτις, 192  
ἀγνωστοί θεοί, 222  
ἀγροιώτης (Hom.), 52  
αἴγλη (Hom.), 213  
αἰθήρ, οὐρανός, δῆρ (Hom.), 213  
Ἀκοαί (I. G. iv. 955, l. 10), 138  
ἀλῆς, 'wit,' 139  
ἀμφεγνήεις, 296  
δοῖος, 50  
δρακος, 192  
ἀσπιδιώτης, 'in scuto iens,' 51  
ἀτμήν, 60  
αὐτομολία, 79  
Ἀχιλεὺς, 71

A.

βρυώνη—βρυωνία, 192  
βυζίν, 190

B.

Γ.  
γραμματική, 33  
γρίπος, 194

Γ.

Δ.  
δεῖ, 91 ff.  
διόρθωσις, 'textual criticism,' 41. 44  
δόγμα Ἐπικούρειον, 295  
δοκῶ, 'think,' 75  
δοῦλος, 224  
Δωριῆς, Δωρίς, 72

Δ.

Ε.  
Ἑλληνισμός, 35  
ἐμπειρία (Thuc.), 74  
ἐξεπλάγησαν (Thuc.), 74  
ἐπεῖ, 'though,' 86  
ἐπεισκλητοί, 14  
ἐπητής (Hom.), 60  
ἐρνος (cf. ἄρνυμι), 144  
εὐλαβήθητι, absolute use of, 7  
εὐνή, 57  
ἐχινύπους, 192

E.

Η.  
ἡλιόπυρος, 194  
ἦτορ, 59

H.

Θ.  
\*θαρρετός, 194  
\*θαυλος, 61  
θύρετρα (Hom.), 54

Θ.

Ι.  
ἱππότης, 52  
ἴση φρουρά, 80

I.

Κ.  
κακῶς, 'in vain,' 191  
κέρκοψ, cf. Πέλοψ, 71  
κερτομεῖν, 'to mystify,' 294  
κοίρανος (Hom.), 57  
κόνυζα, 192  
κόρταφος, κόρταλος, 296  
κτείνω (Plato), 233  
κωλώτης, 53

K.

Λ.  
\*λαβῶν, 194  
λαψάνη, 192  
λόγος = 'plan' (Arist.), 10 ff.

A.

Μ.  
\*μέτα = comes, 50  
μόλιβος, 189

M.

Ν.  
νέαιρα, νέαιρα, 122  
νῆσος, 'peninsula,' 66  
νομίζω, 'practise,' 82

N.

Ο.  
οαριστής, οαρισ-ύς, 60  
ὀμφαληγῆμος, 139  
ὀξύρυγχος χαρακτήρ, 68  
ὀρίζεσθαι τι τινί, 9  
ὀρύσσειν, 86

O.

Π.  
\*παραθαλαμίδιον (?), 194  
περόικιον, 192  
πλάσματα, 'comedies,' 45  
πλευρά = costa, 'wife,' 67  
ποδαγός (Soph.), 52  
πόλεμος, 85  
προαίρεσις (Arist.), 11  
προτίθεσθαι (Attic) = ὑποτίθεσθαι (Ionic), 235  
πρόχειρος, 42 n.  
Πρωτεσί-λαος, 59

Π.

*ῥόον* = κατὰ ῥόον, 86  
*σέλας*, 213  
*στάθμη*, 4  
*στρατιώτης*, *στραταγός*, 52  
*\*σύμπληγος*, 194  
*συναγρίς*, 193  
*τανταλωθείς*, 290  
*τέχναι*, 'trades,' 291  
*τραγωδός*, 'singer,' 192

P.

Σ.

T.

*anthias*, 268

A.

*barbarismus* (soloecismus), 38  
*busta*, 'burnt remains,' 30

B.

C.

*canēs*, 296  
*capere timorem*, 271  
*capitunt animis*, 271  
*circumspicere*, 'provide for,' 21 f.  
*Cocles*, 52 f.  
*coloniae et municipia* = 'Italy,' 132  
*comatorius* = *cinerarius* (?), 278  
*comes*, 50  
*comites*, 105  
*crimen adipisci*, 23

D.

*densa carina*, 255  
*Domina*, 114

F.

*familia* (Livy), 291  
*fenestra*, 142  
*fictum*, 31  
*frictulae*, 'baked' bread or fish, 222  
*fultus*, with *in* instead of simple abl., 31

G.

*gens* (Livy), 291  
*gloria*, 142  
*grammatica*, 33 ff.

H.

*halophanta*, *halapanta*, *salap(h)anta*, 48 f.  
*historia*, 45  
*honestus*, 'having held honores,' 23

I.

*Iazyges*, read *Ciziges*, 24

L.

*lacerta*, 53  
*lappa*, 'burdock,' 140  
*ludi*, 25  
*luperci*, 67

M.

*mancus*, 270  
*mensae paniceae*, 66  
*methodice* (historice), 33  
*mitis*, 'gentle,' 255

T.

*ύγιής*, 'valuable,' 46 n.  
*ύπόκρισιν*, 229

Φ.

*φέρετρον*, 54  
*φυλίκη*, 192  
*φυσκία* (?), 86

X.

*χρή*, 90 ff.  
*χρήμα*—*χρήματα* (Hdt.), 138

## B.—LATIN.

*miluus*, 268  
*mormyres*, 269  
*mulo inscitior*, 205

N.

*ne* enclitic, 291  
*neaea* = *mevetrix*, 121 f.  
*nitor*, with *in* instead of simple abl., 32  
*nuntiare*, used absolutely, 169

O.

*occulite*, 147  
*oculis inunctis*, 'unsalved eyes,' 142

P.

*paconius*, 134  
*patet*, impersonal, 27  
*pellex* = πάλλαξ = Παλλάς? 67  
*penes* = 'nach jemandes Ansicht,' 144  
*Perilla*, 22, 26 f.  
*petit*, in pregnant constr., 107  
*plura uerba* = 'formations,' 38  
*pompilus*, 269  
*pontes*, 'paths,' 290  
*poples*, 53  
*prohibere*, followed by infin., 27  
*purpurae*, 150

Q.

*queruntur*, 'sing,' 61

R.

*recognitio equitum*, 23  
*ruricola* (Ovid), 54

S.

*salapantium*, 48 f.  
*sermo*, 'usage,' 36 = *plura uerba*, 38  
*solutus*, 26  
*spatium*, 'lapse of time,' 254  
*stirps*, 291  
*Suauiulua*, 122

T.

*Tecusa* = 'mother,' 67  
*Teretae* (Toretiae), 24  
*testari aliquem*, 152 f.  
*tityrus* = *satyrus*, 'lecher,' 216  
*trahere*, 'card,' 149; (medical), 25; 'trail,' 150

V.

*uir*, emphatic, 258  
*uota facere*, 257

